

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXVIII

NOVEMBER, 1949

No. 1

THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER OF THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

Brendan C. McNally

THE COMING OF ARCHBISHOP ALEMANY TO CALIFORNIA

John B. McGloin

LORD ACTON AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL

Clarence L. Hohl, Jr.

WITTMAN ON HISTORY

Thomas L. Coonan

THE HISTORIC ROLE OF BOURGEOIS LIBERALISM

Thomas P. Neill

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Saint Louis University Press

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a Year

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A SERVICE QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXVIII

NOVEMBER, 1949

No. 1

Editor

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

Editorial Board

THOMAS L. COONAN
JASPER W. CROSS
ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI
LOWRIE J. DALY
JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

LAURENCE J. KENNY
THOMAS F. O'CONNOR
THOMAS P. NEILL
PAUL G. STEINBICKER
HERBERT WEINSCHEL

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri. THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the CATHOLIC BOOKMAN and THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER OF THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY	3
<i>Brendan C. McNally</i>	
THE COMING OF ARCHBISHOP ALEMANY TO CALIFORNIA	5
<i>John B. McGloin</i>	
LORD ACTON AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL	7
<i>Clarence L. Hohl, Jr.</i>	
WITTMAN ON HISTORY	15
<i>Thomas L. Coonan</i>	
THE HISTORIC ROLE OF BOURGEOIS LIBERALISM	17
<i>Thomas P. Neill</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS	21

CONTRIBUTORS

BRENDAN C. McNALLY, S.J., A.M., Ph.D., is instructor in history, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts.

JOHN B. MCGLOIN, S.J., A.M., Ph.D., is assistant professor of history, University of San Francisco.

CLARENCE J. HOHL, JR., B. S., is instructor of history, Saint Louis University, and is completing his studies for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of Modern European History.

THOMAS L. COONAN, S.T.L., S.T.D., Ph.D., is associate professor of history, Saint Louis University, and a member of the editorial board of the BULLETIN.

THOMAS P. NEILL, A.M., Ph.D., is associate professor of history, Saint Louis University, and a member of the editorial board of the BULLETIN.

The American Newspaper of the Early Nineteenth Century

Brendan C. McNally, S. J.

College of the Holy Cross

IN JANUARY of the current year, for the first time in the history of our country, vast numbers of Americans were able to witness the inauguration of the President of the United States. The wonder of television brought the proceedings at Washington into thousands of homes, public auditoria, television showrooms, and taverns. Indeed, many people hundreds of miles removed from the actual scene enjoyed a better view of the impressive ceremony than did the special guests seated but a few yards from the inaugural platform. The members of the television audience could hear the solemn phrases of the oath of office and the various speeches of the occasion with a clarity that left nothing to be desired. Seemingly, modes of communication have been so highly perfected that the only possible advance could be in the sudden resurrection of the Magic Carpet of legendary fame to transport the interested populace to the sites of great happenings. Strange as it may seem to a generation that takes the telegraph, the wireless, the telephone, radio, and now television for granted, these wondrous instruments have all been the products of man's genius during the past one hundred and twenty years.

Prior to the invention of the telegraph by Samuel Finley Breese Morse in the early 1830's methods of communication and interchange of ideas between men separated by distances, great and small, were almost as primitive as they had been for centuries. News, in the main, traveled from one point to another only as rapidly as a sailing vessel could make its way from port to port, or as rapidly as a lumbering stagecoach could rumble its heavy way from town to town. It is true that in time post-riders hastened the delivery of mail and important documents, but, for the most part, the transmission of news was dependent on the sailing vessel and the stage coach.¹ Small wonder is it then that the editors of the United States newspapers, in the early portion of the nineteenth century, printed foreign news that was months old, and, oftentimes,

domestic news that was weeks old.² There were no ace correspondents located in the various world centers possessed of facilities to pour news items of immediate occurrence into the editorial rooms of the various papers.

Slow and toilsome though the transmission of news may have been, the newspapers printed in the cities and towns of the United States in the first quarter of the nineteenth century did, all things considered, keep their readers rather well informed as to foreign and domestic news. In brief, they were news-worthy. The best and most prolific sources of foreign news were, naturally enough, packets of foreign newspapers, thoughtfully transported to American ports by considerate sea-captains. Papers from London, Paris, Lisbon, Cadiz, and the ports of South America were eagerly awaited by editors in coastal cities and the reprinted portions were, likewise, eagerly seized upon by the publishers of newspapers printed in areas removed from the coast. The acquisition of such newsmanna was noted: "Latest from England—London papers to the 11th ult. have been received at New York"; "a file of Mexican gazettes have been received at Philadelphia—latest date June 3"; "By an arrival at Newport, we have London dates to the 11th of June"; "Buenos Aires—We have received some Buenos Aires newspapers." Thus it was that direct news was received from many different places and, on occasion, bits of information were received in indirect or circuitous fashion: "Late accounts from Carthagena (says a Jamaica paper) state the Independents . . .".

A second source of foreign news was the information conveyed personally to the editors by the captains of ships and travelers who were returning from visits to distant places: "Captain Hodge, of the ship Wallace arrived here on Wednesday from Lisbon, informs us that the latest news of the armies" . . .

Boston, May 18.

Latest from Lisbon. Yesterday arrived here, ship Columbia, Jennison, 30 days from Lisbon—Mr. S. A. Wells. (*sic*) passenger in the above vessel reports that Badajoz . . . capitulated to the English on the 6th of April.

² Editors of publications in centers remote from the Atlantic coastal cities were wholly dependent for their foreign news upon the arrival of the mails. On Thursday, October 11, 1811, Joseph Charless of the *Missouri Gazette*, published at St. Louis, announced: "In consequence of an alteration in the arrival of the Mail, this paper will in future be published on Saturday." In his paper of Wednesday, April 14, 1819, Charless complained, "No mails from beyond Shawanoetown [*sic*] were received here on Monday last. . . . Whilst the high waters remain the Eastern and Southern Mails will be stopped, and our news must be gathered from a very limited circle."

¹ The editors were not above accepting news items from "privateers" as the following from *Niles Weekly Register*, June 11, 1814, will attest: "By the arrival of the famous privateer Scourge, at Chatham, Cape Cod, from Norway, we have some interesting news from that country."

In their issue of Thursday, December 4, 1823, Ritchie and Gooch, editors of the *Richmond Enquirer* boasted that President James Monroe's historic Message to Congress of December 2 had been transported from Washington to their office at Richmond in "seventeen hours". With understandable pride the editors added: "A degree of despatch, hitherto without example."

EARTHQUAKE IN VENEZUELA

By the arrival of the schooner *Independence*, Betts, at the port of Baltimore on Wednesday last from Laguayra, (*sic*) we learn that Caracas, Laguayra and the adjacent villages were destroyed in great manner by an Earthquake—Twenty-five hundred in La-

guayra . . .

The reprinting of letters written from various points of interest served to enlighten both the editors and their readers. Ordinarily, to give greater authority and credibility to a letter, the writer was termed "a gentleman of respectability":

FROM THE RED RIVER HERALD—EXTRA

Extract of a letter from a gentleman of the first respectability, dated Natchitoches, September 4, and received by this day's mail.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman of high respectability at Natchitoches, to the editors of the *Natchez Chronicle*, dated May 10, 1812.³

The editors, unlike too many of their counterparts of our day, simply printed the news as received. In their essentials, however, the newspapers of the nineteenth century were similar to the publications of a century later. True it is that the former lacked comics, picture advertising, photographs and the like, but in journalistic essentials they differed little from the modern newspaper. In page size the papers of the period under consideration were similar to our modern tabloid. Almost universally they consisted of one large sheet folded in the center, and thus space was provided for four pages of printed matter. Across the top of the first page, in bold lettering, appeared the name of the paper, e. g., *Columbian-Centinel*, *Missouri Gazette*, *National Intelligencer*, *Richmond Enquirer*, *Louisiana Gazette*, etc. Very often, below the name of the paper appeared the name of the publisher, e. g., Joseph Gales, Publisher.⁴ Headlines were not employed, but individual columns were captioned in large and black type, "National Events," "Great Catastrophe," "Extract from Cobbett's Weekly Register," "South America," "Latest from Europe," etc. In most instances each page was divided into five columns of type and that format applied to advertisements as well as to news accounts. The former, plus legal notices, generally occupied a goodly portion of the last page; however, on occasion, advertisements and legal notices appeared on the first page. Advertisements consisted of brief printed notices and were illustrated only on rare occasions. The print used was somewhat smaller than that of our newspapers, and it is an extremely tiring task to scan the printing for any extended period.

The daily paper had not become a universal institution in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Some papers were published weekly, others semi-weekly or tri-weekly, and still others were published daily. Common impressions notwithstanding, as early as 1783 Benjamin Towne published the first daily Ameri-

³ This and the preceding examples are from *Niles Weekly Register*, 1812, *passim*.

The names of the sailing vessels which served as the purveyors of world news were quite as variable as are the names of race horses in our own day. "Teazer", "Growler", "Six Sisters", "Heavenly Wind", "Scourge", "Independence", "Columbia", "Fortitude", "Rose Petal", "Golden Rod", are but a few of the names encountered.

⁴ In some instances the name of the publisher appeared at the bottom of the last page. The *Richmond Enquirer* employed a six-column format, a practice which was adopted by several other papers in the early 1820s.

can newspaper in the city of Philadelphia. That publication which bore the name *Pennsylvania Evening Post* is duly accredited as having been the first daily newspaper printed in the United States. Towne's efforts proved unsuccessful, and he abandoned his daily experiment a little over a year after its initiation. The competition provided by a new daily, the *Pennsylvania Packet and Daily Advertiser*, September, 1784, was too much for Towne. The *Packet and Daily Advertiser*, published by John Dunlap and David C. Claypool, proved popular and continued in existence for more than half a century. This new experiment occasioned emulation:

A few months after the *Packet* had demonstrated the practicability of a daily in Philadelphia, New York had a similar paper—the *New York Daily Advertiser*. Philadelphia and New York long kept the leadership in daily papers; at the close of the century, the former had six of them and the latter five. Boston, though it had two short-lived attempts of this kind, gave no consistent support to daily publication in the eighteenth century. But the rising commercial center of Baltimore supported three dailies by 1800; and further south, Charleston, in size the fourth American city, had two.⁵

The daily editions did not, however, supplant the semi-weekly and tri-weekly editions wholly and entirely. Even those editors who were brave enough to undertake publication of dailies continued to print semi-weekly or tri-weekly editions for distribution, via the mails, outside the immediate confines of the city or town in which they were published.⁶ The "semis" and the "tris" contained all the news published in the daily editions, but the space devoted to advertisements was greatly reduced.

The editors employed, naturally enough, their own proper journalistic styles, but, almost universally, there is found a quaintness of expression and a conservatism that is wholly eschewed by journalists of this day. In the treatment of certain types of news the older writers were much more frank and realistic than the modern. And yet, tortuous circumlocutions were often employed to avoid direct mention of certain aspects of everyday life that we take for granted and see publicized on every side. On the other hand, subjects and quaint terminology which would not be mentioned in polite society today were treated in the matter of fact fashion.

In the main, the interests of human beings do not differ radically from century to century, and the news interests of men and women in the first quarter of the nineteenth century were not greatly dissimilar to those which move men and women of our own day to consult the columns of the newspapers. News of national affairs received a relatively large coverage in most papers. The *National Intelligencer* of Washington was the great source, along with other Washington papers, of happenings in the national capital. The activities of Congress normally received at least one full column on the front page, recording the day-by-day accom-

⁵ Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), p. 116. Mott also notes on pages 116, 117 of this same work that London had daily papers from 1702; Augsburg, Germany, from 1718, and Paris from 1777.

⁶ The *National Intelligencer*, Washington, D. C., was published tri-weekly when Congress was in session; semi-weekly when Congress was recessed. In the later years of this period the *National Intelligencer* printed a daily edition, but the tri-weekly edition was continued for "distribution through the country."

(Please turn to page eleven)

The Coming of Archbishop Alemany to California

John B. McGloin, S. J.

University of San Francisco

Editor's Note: Alemany and other early Catholic characters of story of American California will receive fuller treatment in other McGloin's forthcoming study, "The Eloquent Indian," The Life of James Bouchard, California Jesuit (Stanford University Press, December).

JOSEPH SADOC ALEMANY of the Order of Preachers, first Bishop of Monterey in California (1850-1853), and first Archbishop of San Francisco (1853-1884), was a simple friar, and yet he was a distinct ornament of the hierarchy of the Catholic church in the United States. Even though his pioneer pontificate in California was not without its storms and stresses, the prelate of Monterey and San Francisco emerges from the rigid tests of the inquiring historian as a distinguished child of his religious order and of the church, as well as a worthy successor to his Franciscan predecessor, Bishop Garcia Diego.

Archbishop Alemany was born at Vich in Spain, in 1814, and died in his native country at Valencia, in 1888. He entered the Dominican Order at an early age and at twenty-three was ordained priest by Bishop Gaspar Pianetti at Viterbo in Italy. After a decade of missionary experience in the United States, where he labored in Tennessee, Kentucky and Ohio, he journeyed to Rome as a Dominican Provincial-Superior on business for his order. While there, he was selected by Pius IX as the first Bishop of American California, on the recommendation of the American bishops who had assembled at Baltimore in May, 1849. His was a very reluctant acceptance, and it was only out of deference to the will of the Supreme Pontiff that Father Joseph Sadoc finally accepted the episcopal burden. On June 30, 1850, in Rome, he was consecrated as Bishop of Monterey in California by Cardinal Ranzoni, who was assisted by the Archbishops Joseph Valerga, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and John Stefanelli, Archbishop of Trajanopolis. Alemany had the advantage of American citizenship and a facility with the English language, two things which were to go far in recommending him to his flock in California. The news of his appointment did not reach California, however, until he himself arrived there and made public the fact that the California Catholic Church was no longer bereft of a pastor. Our immediate interest in the Dominican prelate begins with his arrival in San Francisco on December 6, 1850.

The *Alta California*, of San Francisco, thus announced the coming of Archbishop Alemany:

Passengers, per steamer Columbus, from Panama,

Rt. Rev. Joseph Vilarassa,
Rev. Joseph Alemany,
Sister Mary Goermere.¹

The following news item in the same issue furnished

interesting but inaccurate information on the same subject:

The steamer *Columbus* arrived last night about 11 o'clock. It brought up 95 passengers, among whom we noted the names of the Rt. Rev. Francis Villarassa, Rev. Joseph Alemany and sister, Mary Goesnerd [sic].²

It is interesting to reflect that with the arrival of Bishop Alemany in California, the once potent and prosperous mission establishments of that state, founded and administered by Franciscan friars, now passed under the care of a Dominican friar who had among his few helpers two Jesuit Fathers and several secular priests. Later on, the diocesan clergy would increase in numbers, but even so they would be ruled by a Dominican archbishop for over thirty years.

Mention has been made of the fact that news of the appointment of Alemany had not yet penetrated to the coast of California, and hence it was that Father Langlois, who then held from Administrator Gonzales the title of Vicar of the northern part of the diocese, sent the new prelate to Santa Barbara so that he might present his documents and thus certify his right to enter upon the occupancy of the See of Monterey. This formal procedure Langlois considered necessary, since he had had to deal with clerical impostors already in his short stay in California. At the same time, however, he was so convinced of the legitimacy of Alemany's claims to the see that he gladly permitted him a public reception in San Francisco at the hands of the Catholic citizenry. But, following this, Alemany departed for Santa Barbara to make his presence known to the Franciscan Governor of the Mitre of Both Californias. Once there, he had no difficulty in establishing his claims, since he was amply fortified with the proper authorizations from Rome, and it was with considerable joy that Gonzales Rubio welcomed the new prelate to California. An interregnum which had well-nigh spelled disaster for Catholicism in the territory was now at an end.

What sort of shepherd had the Holy See granted to the Church of California? James M. Montgomery, who was one of the state's most prominent citizens in

² It may readily be imagined that Father Vilarassa, who, like Alemany, was a Dominican and who came to establish his order in American California, was amused at reading that he was the "Right Reverend" of the pair! And, on his part, Alemany must also have enjoyed reading that his "sister" had accompanied him to California; "Mary Goesnerd" was, in fact, Sister Mary Goemere, foundress of the Dominican sisters in California and united to Alemany only in the common spirit of the Dominican family. Thus was the new shepherd introduced to those of his flock who read the *Alta California*!

The arrival of Alemany was thus commemorated by Father Anthony Langlois, first pastor of St. Francis Church, San Francisco, which was founded in 1849, in the closing item of his Journal: "December 6, 1850, at eleven o'clock at night, the steamer *Columbus* brought us the Rev. Joseph Alemany, O. P., Bishop of Monterey and California [sic] . . ."

¹ *San Francisco Daily Alta California*, San Francisco, California, December 7, 1850.

its first years, knew Alemany well, and he has said of him that he was

. . . a complete character, an utterly simple and unadorned personality, who was accustomed to make frequent pastoral visitations throughout his territory without benefit of secretary or companion and who, quite characteristically, used to carry his personal possessions and episcopal paraphernalia in a quaint, greenish old carpet bag.³

In fact, all during his long episcopate, Alemany eschewed pomp and circumstance. He wore the white Dominican habit rather than the episcopal purple, and the only concessions to prelacy which he made in dress were those of the pectoral cross and bishop's ring. Quite obviously Alemany regarded himself rather as a missionary who happened to be consecrated a prelate and who was never too happy in the distinction. When at length he retired to Spain, after resigning his see on December 28, 1884, one of his last utterances,—"I do not think that I was born to be a Bishop, and I told Pius IX so; but, nevertheless, they made me a Bishop . . ."—confirmed his natural distaste for the episcopal office. However, Alemany was a successful and respected bishop, and his name will always occupy a high place in the story of California Catholicism.

When Father Herbert Vaughan (1832-1903) visited California from England in the early months of 1864, the future Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster was charmed by the simplicity and sturdy piety of Archbishop Alemany. He thus describes the prelate and his surroundings:

Go, then, up California Street in San Francisco, turn around the Cathedral of St. Mary's, and you will enter a miserable, dingy little house. This is the residence of the Archbishop of San Francisco. . . . To the left are a number of little yards, and the back windows of houses in which Chinamen are swarming. Broken pots and pans, old doors and window-frames, faggots, remnants of used fire-works, sides of pig glazed and varnished, long strings of meat (God only knows what meat!) hanging to dry, dog kennels, dead cats, dirty linen in heaps, such is the view on the left. The odors which exhale from it who shall describe?

To the right, adjoining the cathedral, is a yard where stands a little iron or zinc cottage, containing two rooms; this is where the Archbishop lives. One is his bedroom, and the other is his office, where his secretaries are at work all day. No man is more poorly lodged in the whole city, and no man better preaches the spirit of evangelical poverty and detachment in the midst of this money worshiping city than this Dominican Spanish Archbishop of San Francisco. From ten to one every morning, and from two to three hours every evening, His Grace, arrayed in his common white habit with his green cord and pectoral cross, receives all who come to consult him, to beg of him, to converse with him, be they who they may—emigrants, servants, merchants, the afflicted, the ruined, the unfortunate.

The example of such a life of disinterested zeal, holy simplicity and poverty has told upon the inhabitants of San Francisco with an irresistible power. It has been one of the Catholic influences exercised by the church on the population.⁴

Another interesting vignette of Alemany is furnished in the following incident:

. . . On one occasion (in San Francisco), during a large fire, the

³ Mr. Montgomery was interviewed by Sister Gertrude Mary Gray, College of the Holy Names, Oakland, California, who has written an as yet unpublished Master's thesis (Catholic University of America) on Archbishop Alemany.

⁴ Herbert Vaughan, "The Church in California," *Dublin Review*, VI (New Series) (January, 1866), 1-35. Vaughan was in California on a begging tour for the missionary society he had founded in England. The title now given to this group of priests is that of "Mill Hill Fathers of the Foreign Missions," and they may be said to be equivalent to the Maryknoll Fathers of the United States.

Vaughan collected \$25,000 during his five months tour of California.

firemen of one of the engines were completely worn out and appealed in vain to the crowd standing around to aid them—until a man came running up, having just rescued two children from a house burning nearby, and called out to the crowd in English to go to work, and also spoke in Spanish for others to assist. Immediately they began to work at the engines, relieving the exhausted firemen. When inquiring who the man was, I learned that he was Dr. Alemany [sic], the present Bishop of California. Though a small man physically and slightly built, he worked for hours that morning at the engines and influenced others to do the same. There was not a stronger man for his size in California. There were important fires in San Francisco where the Bishop and his friend Rev. Mr. O'Connell [sic] were absent. The exertions of the clergymen at fires were well known and appreciated by the firemen of San Francisco, by whom, as well as by their own flock, they were beloved and respected, their humble and unassuming manner endearing them to everyone.⁵

This, then, was the shepherd whom Pius IX had granted to the Catholic Church. El Ilustrisimo Señor Fray Francisco Garcia Diego y Moreno, the Franciscan who first ruled the California church, 1840-1846, had received a worthy successor!

A San Francisco correspondent of the *Baltimore Catholic Mirror* thus reported the welcome accorded the thirty-six-year-old Alemany in what was, three years later, to become his see city:

The Rt. Rev. Joseph Alemany [sic], Bishop of California arrived in this city on Saturday, the 7th of December [actually it was December 6] by steamer from Panama. He brought with him a few priests [i. e., one] and one Dominican sister. Their arrival has created heartfelt joy.

On Tuesday evening, December 10, 1850, the Catholics of San Francisco assembled at the schoolhouse attached to the church of St. Francis to have an outpouring of their feelings on this auspicious event. An address of welcome was presented to the Bishop, who responded in a paternal and feeling manner. About \$1400 was made up and presented to him by the meeting. His manifests much affection and solicitude for his flock, and doubtless will be acceptable to all Catholics here, of whatever clime or tongue.

A year ago, the Holy Sacrifice was celebrated in a small room without pews or sanctuary. Now we have a neat frame church with sixty-four pews, and this does not contain more than half our people. There are, however, three or four Masses every Sunday, so that all can be accommodated. Father Langlois has been our pastor for a year and a half and has, under all circumstances and in the face of many obstacles, proved himself a zealous and true shepherd. He has done a great deal of good.⁶

The episcopal heart of Joseph Sadoc Alemany must have been warmed that night as he listened to the sincere words of welcome addressed to him by his assembled flock. He was "bid a hearty welcome to this land" and assured that his "spiritual children in Christ rejoice to meet you as our Father and our Prelate."

The address concluded as follows: "You are worthy of the episcopate and your career among us will furnish an exemplification of the character described by the inspired writer: 'Behold a great priest!'"⁷

The later history of the California episcopate of Joseph Sadoc Alemany furnishes a complete corroboration of this prediction. He was, indeed, a great priest and a great bishop.

When Alemany's turn arrived that night, he replied to these sentiments with a felicity of phrase which seemed natural to his courteous self. He spoke of the long and tedious journey which he had just completed

⁵ Francis Cassin—*A Few Facts on California* (unpublished manuscript (1878), Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.

⁶ *Baltimore Catholic Mirror*, February 8, 1851.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

Lord Acton and the Vatican Council

Clarence L. Hohl, Jr.

Saint Louis University

JOHN EMERICH EDWARD DALBERG ACTON, the first Lord Acton, was born on January 10, 1834, of the marriage of Sir Richard Acton, Seventh Baronet, and the heiress of the German house of Dalberg, in Naples, Italy. He was, in the words of Lord Bryce, "the most truly cosmopolitan of her children."¹ He belonged to an old Roman Catholic family of Cheshire, was educated at Oscott, one of the two chief Roman Catholic colleges of England (at that time) under Dr. Wiseman, afterwards Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal. However, the most important of his student years were those spent with Dr. von Döllinger at Munich, whither Acton had gone for advanced study because his application to Cambridge was rejected on religious grounds.

Acton was acquainted with Montalambert, de Lacoste, Bluntschli, the jurist, Von Sybel and Franke the historians, Roth, famous for his "Ethik", and Roscher, the economic scientists, and Harnack, the theologian. In 1856, Acton and Dr. Döllinger traveled to America; the history and constitutional development of that country had a marked effect on Acton. Lord Acton belonged to the Manchester school of economics of Cobden and Wright, and was regarded as a true Liberal by his contemporaries.

From 1859 to 1865, Acton was a Member of Parliament, representing the Catholic borough of Merton. His parliamentary career was most unimpressive, and the sum total of his words consisted of two questions and one speech, which was made on May 4, 1860. It was an appeal for information about the papal states government.²

In 1859, Acton took over the editorship of *The Rambler* from John Henry Newman, and from this point onward he became engaged in the struggle between the Liberal Catholics and the more conservative Catholics. *The Rambler* was abolished in 1862 to be immediately succeeded by the *Home and Foreign Review*, which was simply a continuation of the *Rambler*. In August, 1862, Cardinal Wiseman severely criticised both Acton and the *Review* on account of their liberal leanings. Acton's reply is indicative of his attitude on the burning question of being both a Liberal and a Catholic.

In the Cardinal's support and approbation of our work we could recognize an aid more valuable to the cause we are engaged than the utmost support which could be afforded to us by any other person. The foundation of the *Review* is a humble faith in the infallible teaching of the Catholic Church, a devotion to a cause which controls every other interest, and an attachment to her authority which no other influence can supplant. If in anything published by us a passage can be found which is contrary to that doctrine, incomparably with that devotion, or dis-

¹ Bryce, James, *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1904), p. 382.

² Auchmuty, James J., "Acton's Election As An Irish Member of Parliament," *English Historical Review*, LXI (1946).

respectful to that authority, we sincerely retract and lament it. No such passage was ever consciously admitted into the pages either of the late *Rambler* or of the *Review* . . . the political and intellectual orders remain permanently distinct from the spiritual. They follow their own ends, they obey their own laws, and in doing so they support the cause of religion by the discovery of truth and the upholding of right. A political law or a scientific truth may be perilous to the morals or the faith of the individuals, but it cannot on this ground be resisted by the Church . . . A discovery may be made in science which will shake the faith of thousands, yet religion cannot reject it or object to it. The difference in this respect between a true religion and a false religion is, that one judges all things by the standard of their truth, the other by the touchstone of its own interests. A false religion fears the progress of all truth; a true religion seeks and recognizes truth wherever it can be found.³

When we recall that one of the more famous dictums of Pius IX's *Syllabus of Errors* was that "The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism and recent civilization" it is easy to understand why Acton was regarded with suspicion by the Ultramontanes. However, in 1864 Acton announced his decision to suspend publication of the *Review* in his article, "Conflicts with Rome". He announced he could not change his views, but neither would he continue to flout the hierarchy, and since the Roman Pontiff had spoken, his only recourse was to silence. He could not abandon principles he sincerely held. He could not reject the judgment of the Holy See without committing the sin of apostasy. "The principles had not ceased to be true, nor the authority to be legitimate, because the two were in contradiction."⁴ Acton's decision was made when he was only thirty years of age.

In 1867-1868 Acton went to Rome as a correspondent for the newly formed *Chronicle*, and it was while acting as correspondent that his famous conflict with the Church took place. He remained in Rome until July 18, 1870, which was six weeks prior to the final public session of the Vatican Council. Acton got off on the wrong foot, as far as the Ultramontanes were concerned, by writing in the early weeks of 1868 an article for the *Chronicle* entitled the "Massacre of St. Bartholomew"; in this essay he tried to prove that the actions of the French monarchy had been inspired in Rome.⁵ In 1869 a famous book appeared in Munich, entitled, *The Pope and the Council*, which from the Catholic point of view combatted the doctrine of infallibility. Acton added to the conflict by giving this book a favorable review in the short-lived publication the *North British Review*. In his review Acton pleaded for a new Council of Trent which would reform,

³ Paul, Herbert, editor, "Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone" (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905), pp. 34-35.

⁴ This essay first appeared in *The Rambler, New Series*, IV, January (1864); reprinted in *The History of Freedom and Other Essays* (London: Macmillan Company, 1907), pp. 461-91.

⁵ Acton, John, "The Massacre of St. Bartholomew", *The Chronicle*, II (February, 1868), 158-80.

remodel and adapt the work of the original Trent to modern times.⁶

All of this may serve as an introduction to Acton's activities during the Vatican Council. I think it has been demonstrated that Lord Acton was hostile to the council, but I would not agree with Fr. MacCaffrey when he says, "Lord Acton spared neither argument nor invective to cast ridicule on the doctrine and its supporters."⁷ He did not ridicule when he attacked anything. His method and manner were against such an attitude. To illustrate this point, let us look at an article, entitled, "The Next General Council," which he had written in 1867 for the *Chronicle*. This article demonstrates all of the prejudices which Lord Acton carried with him to Rome, but there is in it no ridicule.

Nothing less than a General Council can enforce a more explicit acquiescence in the ideas of the Encyclical and syllabus of 1864 . . . It is the only means of terminating another controversy of a much longer standing. From the days of Baronius and Bellarmin, the Roman Divines have held that the Pope is infallible whenever he pronounces in his Pontifical Character on questions of faith and morals. This opinion has never prevailed in the Church; and the division it has caused, though preserving theology from stagnation, has sometimes been a source of outward injury to stagnation.⁸

Speaking in terms of Marsiglio of Padua and other followers of the conciliar theory, he continues:

. . . A decree proclaiming the Pope infallible would be a confession that the authority of General Councils has been an illusion, and a virtual usurpation from the first. . . . The responsibility for the acts of the buried and repented past would come back at once and forever with crushing weight on the Church. The Bulls which imposed a belief in the deposing power, the Bulls which prescribed the tortures and kindled the flames of the Inquisition, the Bulls which erected witchcraft into a system and made the extermination of witches a frightful reality, would become as venerable as the decrees of Nicaea, as uncontrovertible as the writings of St. Luke.⁹

It might be well to mention here that an article on papal infallibility, by E. Dublanchy, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, lists only twelve documents from the time of Leo I to Pius IX¹⁰, which contain an infallible definition. Thus we can see that Acton's fears were groundless, and also that he did not understand the Church's method of teaching.

Lord Acton played a major role in the opposition to the definition of the doctrine of papal infallibility. He was an outside-the-council leader of the minority bishops. Bryce says of Acton's role during the Vatican Council:

His full and accurate knowledge of ecclesiastical history was placed at the disposal of the prelates, such as Bishop Dupanloup, Bishop Strossmeyer, and Archbishop Conolly, who combatted the Ultramontane party in animated and protracted debates which illumined that Oecumenical Council. One, at least, of the treatises, and many of the letters in the press which the Council called forth were written either by him or from materials which he supplied, and he was recognized by the Ultramontanes, and in particular by Archbishop Manning, as being, along with Döllinger, the most formidable of their opponents behind the scenes.¹¹

⁶ Acton, John, "The Pope and the Council," *North British Review* (October, 1869), pp. 127-35.

⁷ MacCaffrey, Rev. James, *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 volumes (London: Gill & Son, 1910), p. 64.

⁸ Acton, John, "The Next General Council," *Chronicle*, July 13, 1867, pp. 367-8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 369-70.

¹⁰ Volume VII, 2nd part.

¹¹ Bryce, *op. cit.*, p. 385.

Acton wrote little in the way of formal articles while the Vatican Council was in session. However his correspondence is the most intimate and revealing concerning his feelings and opinions concerning the council. The correspondence with Döllinger has never been published, and thus we must rely mainly upon his correspondence with William Gladstone and the famous "Romische Briefe vom Konzil von Quirinus." The latter consists of sixty-nine letters published in the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* from December 1869 to July of 1870. There seems to be no doubt that Dr. Döllinger was the writer, Quirinus, but there has always been a question as to whether Acton did not supply much of the information used. Today, it is generally believed that he was one of the three correspondents Döllinger had in Rome, but definite proof will be lacking until the Acton-Döllinger correspondence is published. A few extracts will illustrate the character of these letters:

Rome, December, 1869. The Council is opened. . . . Two great questions are in every mind, and on every tongue: first, wherein will the freedom promised to the Council consist, and how far will it extend? And, secondly, will papal Infallibility be erected into a dogma? . . . That great ecclesiastical polypus with its thousand feelers, and arms, the Jesuit Order, works furtively under the earth and on the earth . . . and thus, if Papal Infallibility becomes a dogma, what inevitably awaits us is, that the Jesuits . . . will for the future be the regular stewards of the treasure, and the architects of the new dogma we have to expect.

Rome, January 30, 1870 . . . The Bishops see now that the grand aim of the Order is to establish at least one fortress in each diocese with a papal garrison, and to hold bishops, clergy, and people under complete subjection to Rome and her commands.

Rome, Feb. 4 . . . Only one kind of freedom can be spoken here—the freedom of the Church, and in their favorite and accustomed manner of speech, by the Church is intended the Pope, and by freedom domination over the state, according to the Decretals.

In this style and tone the letters continue with repeated emphasis on the council being another Jesuitical plot, abetted by Pius, and sealed against the aims of true freedom. Gertrude Himmelfarb in her introduction to a recent collection of Acton's essays¹², says:

The letters from Rome on the Council are a fascinating study of the techniques used by Rome to impose her will. They were based on daily, personal observations, and because the details are so sharp and unmarred by retrospections, they are a valuable source of material for a sociological study of the institutions and forms of power that can be pressed into the service of a supposedly religious cause.¹³

Acton and Döllinger were using a two-pronged attack: Döllinger was to sway public opinion, and Acton was to work on the bishops. To understand Acton's work among the bishops it is necessary to recall his correspondence with Gladstone, with whom he had been on intimate terms for many years. In fact, it was Gladstone who secured for Acton his elevation to Lordship. These letters give a most detailed picture of his labors. He says in his first letter, dated January 1, 1870, "I live almost entirely with the Opposition." Acton felt that the opposition pleaded a lost cause unless outside pressure could be obtained from the leading statesmen of Europe. In this same letter Acton pi-

¹² Letters from Rome on the Council by Quirinus (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1928), pp. 59, 66, 74, 79. As quoted in Lally.

¹³ Essays on Freedom and Power, edited by Gertrude Himmelfarb (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1948).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. xxiii-xxiv.

ures Pius IX as striving to become another Innocent II or Boniface VIII. As Professor Lally says:

He had Papal Absolutism on the brain in those days; and in three documents he perceived an organized conspiracy to revive all the tremendous claims of the medieval papacy, which conspiracy, he said, could only be met and defeated through the Episcopate, but judged by what he had seen and heard since the opening of the Council the Episcopate was exceedingly helpless.¹⁵

After these introductory remarks Lord Acton comes to the main point of his letter to Gladstone. He urged state intervention in the proceedings of the council because he felt that the minority was utterly helpless in the face of the organized papal forces. Thus, he concluded, the time seemed "to have arrived when the counsel of England, or of the other Powers speaking in concert with England, should be given to the Council."¹⁶

Acton's next important letter to Gladstone bears the date of February 16, and is perhaps his most important letter to the British Prime Minister. In his opening paragraph he says that the leading bishops of the minority, at whose request he now wrote, had adopted his view, that they would prevail with the aid of the European powers, and would fail without it. Then Acton arrives at his main point: the introduction of a new "Schema" which he said, proposed to make civil legislation on all points of contract, marriage, clerical immunities, education, even on many questions of taxation and Common Law, subject to the legislation of the Church, which would simply be the will of the Pope.¹⁷

Gladstone's reply was dated March 1 and in a word said that intervention was impossible and not to be hoped for, because Bismarck would not cooperate, the attitude of Austria was indecisive and Bavaria was timorous.¹⁸

Despite Gladstone's rejection of his plan, Lord Acton persisted in his efforts with three more letters, dated March 10 and 11, and March 20. In these letters he describes his role in writing the official "French Minority Protest to the doctrine of Papal Infallibility." He wrote the eighth and ninth chapters of the protest, and these chapters affirmed the principle that no dogma might be proclaimed which does not command a moral unanimity among the bishops representing churches, and made the claim that to make dogmas in the absence of such unanimity endangered the authority, liberty and ecumenicity of the council.

There is no doubt, I think, that the issuing of the proposed Decrees puts the Governments in a position more favorable for action. The prerogative of inerrancy or infallibility in all questions of conscience, gives the Pope the ultimate control over the consciences of Catholics, in politics and society. Catholics . . . will not be at liberty to reject the deposing power, or the system of the Inquisition, or any other criminal practice or idea which has become established under the penalty of excommunication. They must once become the irreconcilable enemies of civil and religious liberties.¹⁹

Acton continued to write to Gladstone until June 5.

¹⁵ Lally, F. E., *As Lord Acton Says* (Newport, R. I., 1942), p. 90.

¹⁶ Figgis, J. & Laurence, R., *Selection from Correspondence of the First Lord Acton* (London, 1917), I, 96.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

¹⁹ Figgis & Laurence, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

These later letters are not too important. They are simply a reiteration of his previous requests for some action by the British government and/or a public statement by Mr. Gladstone. He left Rome during the week of June 12 and he did not return. In September of that year (1870) he took his last action in connection with the Vatican Council. This was his famous "Sendschreiben an Einen Deutschen Bischof des Vatikanischen Concils"; although it was addressed to a German bishop, it was meant for every member of the minority. A few excerpts will illustrate the tone of this letter:

A large part of the Catholic world honors in the Minority of the Council Fathers the true witnesses of its faith, and will in the future remain inseparably united with men whose stand in the very recent past awakened so much confidence. But the hour of critical decision has come, and the voices which were eagerly listened to are suddenly hushed. When the need of the individual begins, there suddenly disappears the wished for guidance. When the observations on Infallibility which the bishops had sent in to the Commission appeared in printed form, it seemed that the Minority had burnt their ships. They affirmed that the Dogma would put an end to the conversion of Protestants, that it would drive devout men out of the Church and make Catholicism indefensible in controversy, that it would give governments apparent reason to doubt the fidelity of Catholics, and would give new authority to the theory of persecution and of the deposing power. They testified that it was unknown in many parts of the Church, and was denied by the Fathers, so that neither perpetuity nor universality could be pleaded in its favor; and they declared it an absurd contradiction, founded on ignoble faith, and incapable of being made an article of faith by Pope or council. . . . Such is the picture of the Vatican Council and its work that we receive from men like Schwarzenberg, Rauscher, Dupanloup, Haynald, Ketteler, Clifford, Purcell, Connolly, Darboy, Hefele, Strossmayer, Kenrick. They declare that the new Dogmas were neither taught by the Apostles, nor believed by the Fathers, that they are soul-destroying errors, contradictory of true ecclesiastical teaching, founded on fraud, a disgrace for Catholics. One should understand that no judgment can be less ambiguous, no speech more open, no witness more competent, or more decisive for the conscience of the faithful. There seems no more possible doubt about the opinion of the Minority.²⁰

Acton then proceeds to consider the fact that many of the minority bishops have announced their submission to the doctrine. He states the problem and the appeal in these words:

If, however, in the beginning many have doubted neither the truth of their words, nor the firmness of their disposition, this good faith is shattered, since individual Bishops have proclaimed the Decree, without a word of warning that it contains erroneous teaching, and issues from an insufficient authority. . . . It is not surprising, if now the question is pressed whether those amazing statements in Rome were just, or were meant wholly seriously.²¹

In his conclusion Acton says, "I believe that you will not forget your words, that you will not disclaim your work; for I set my trust in those Bishops, who in the last hour of the Council admonished their colleagues, that one must persevere to the end, and give the world an example of courage and constancy which it so greatly needs."²²

The "Sendschreiben" was Acton's last direct and immediate connection with the events of the Vatican Council. However, a month earlier, in August of 1870, he had written an article for the *North British Review*, entitled, "The Vatican Council", which was a bitter judgment of the council.²³ This article was

²⁰ Letter to A German Bishop of the Vatican Council, Nordlingen, Sept., 1870, pp. 1-14.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

²³ "The Vatican Council," *North British Review*, October, 1870.

based on his own reflections and not on the opinions of others. His opening statement clearly demonstrates his personal opinion of the real purpose for such a council: "The Council did not originate in the desire to exalt beyond measure the cause of Rome. It was proposed in the interest of moderation. . . . The Vatican Council was the first sufficient occasion which Catholicism had enjoyed to reform, remodel and adapt the work of Trent."²⁴

After this statement, he lapses into a restatement of the "Romische Brief":

The Jesuits had continued to gain ground in Rome ever since the Pope's return. The papal infallibility had always been their favorite doctrine. Its adoption by the Council promised to give their theology official warrant, and to their Order the supremacy of the Church. . . . At the opening of the Council, the known opposition consisted of four men. This very small element grew ultimately into a body of more than a hundred bishops who doggedly asserted that a dogmatic decree required virtual unanimity. . . . To wait for unanimity is to wait forever, and to admit that a minority could prevent, or nullify the dogmatic action of the papacy was to renounce infallibility.²⁵

An event occurred in the following year which placed Lord Acton in a very compromising position. His constant attacks on the Vatican Council and the failure of the opposition to maintain its stand led to a meeting in Munich on May 30, 1871, and to the publication of a statement entitled, "Munich Declaration of Witsuntide, 1871." It was a statement by numerous German scholars, all Catholics, under the leadership of Dr. Döllinger, which rejected the Vatican Council and its decree concerning infallibility. This declaration was the cornerstone of Old Catholicism in Germany and the beginning of the *Los von Rom* movement. Attached to the Munich declaration were thirty-two names; Lord Acton's fifth on the list. However, Acton was not present during the Munich discussions, nor was he consulted about it. His name was used without his knowledge, but because of his notorious opposition to the council, it was presumed by the Munich group that he would want his name listed among the revolters. This presumption was false, and since these facts were commonly known, no action was taken against Lord Acton at this time.

But during those hectic months Lord Acton had spent much of his time in communication with the minority bishops. In addition to the "Sendschreiben," he wrote many individual letters to these men. Typical of these letters, and of particular interest to people of this area, is his letter to Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis. The letter bears the date of March 1, 1871, and in it Acton requests information as to why Kenrick had submitted to the Vatican Decrees. Kenrick's reply is even more interesting and is perhaps typical of why the Vatican Decrees were eventually accepted by the majority of Catholic prelates.

On my return from Europe, I found it absolutely impossible to remain silent. My opposition to the Council had become a matter of notoriety. I could not defend the Council or its action; but I have always professed that the acceptance of either by the Church would supply its deficiency. I accordingly made up my mind to submit to what appeared inevitable, unless I was prepared to separate myself at least in the judgment of most Catholics from the Church. . . . I send Your Lordship, herewith enclosed, the

exact words of my reply to the address of the clergy before the immense concourse of Catholics assembled on the occasion. You will perceive that I gave as the motive of my submission, "simply and singly" the authority of the Church, by which I was well understood to mean that the act was one of pure obedience, and was not grounded on the removal of my motives of opposition to the decrees, as referred to in my reply and set forth in my pamphlet. . . . As long as I may be permitted to remain in my present station I shall confine myself to administrative functions, which I can do the more easily without attracting observation, as for some years back I have seldom preached. My statement to which Your Lordship referred, that Papal Infallibility could not become an article of faith, even by the definition of the Council, resolves itself in the others; namely, that what is not already a doctrine of faith cannot be made so by a Conciliar Definition; and that Papal Infallibility, anterior to the definition was not a doctrine of faith. The first of those propositions is undeniable. The second, appears, must be given up.²⁶

I cite this letter in some detail for it greatly impressed Acton; three years later its words constituted the cornerstone for his submission to the Vatican Council. Acton's correspondence in the following years clearly demonstrate his intention to remain in communication with Rome. His words clearly indicate his desire to avoid a rupture with Rome, but in no way constituted a positive acceptance of the Vatican Decrees. It was not until 1874 that he was willing to profess an unqualified and positive submission to the Acts of the Vatican Council.

The occasion for this public submission was a pamphlet written in November of that year by William Gladstone, entitled, "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance." The work was a tremendous blast against popery, and in it Gladstone set forth four propositions: (1) That Rome, by the Vatican Council, had substituted for its proud boast *semper eadem*, the policy of violence and change of faith; (2) That she had equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history; (3) That she had refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; (4) that no one could now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of the pope.

Fourteen outstanding Catholic leaders in England immediately took up the challenge. Their replies were printed in the London *Times* from November 9 to December 29, 1874. Acton was selected to write the first reply and it appeared on November 9. Acton says:

. . . The doctrines against which you are contending did not begin with the Vatican Council. At the time of repeal of the oath (referring to the Law of 1826 which destroyed the oath required of all Englishmen to the King as head of the Church) the Pope held the same right and power to excommunicate those who denied his authority to depose princes that he possesses now. . . . The recent decrees have neither increased the penalty nor made it more easily to inflict. . . . That is the true answer to your appeal. . . . If you pursue the inquiry further, you will find grave matter than all you have enumerated. . . . And I think you will admit that your Catholic countrymen cannot fairly be called to account for every particle of a system which has never come before them in its integrity, or for opinions whose existence among divines they would be exceedingly reluctant to believe. . . . I will explain my meaning by an example: A Pope who lived in Catholic times, and who is famous in history as the author of the first Crusade, decided that it is no murder to kill an excommunicated person. Again, the greatest legislator of the medieval Church laid down this proposition, that allegiance must not be kept with heretical princes. . . . That opinions likely to injure our position as loyal subjects of a Protestant sovereign, as citizens of a free state, as members of a community divided in religion, have flour-

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Lally, F. E., *op. cit.*, pp. 109-111.

shed in various times, and in various degrees, that they can claim high sanction, that they are often uttered in the exasperation of controversy, and are most strongly urged at a time when there is no possibility of putting them into practice—this all men must concede. . . .²⁷

Acton's letter incited the anger of the Catholics, who in their initial readings presumed his reply to be a public rejection of the Vatican Decrees. The *Times* editorial which accompanied Acton's letter said just this. When Lord Acton read the editorial comment he immediately composed a reply to rectify their misinterpretation of his writing. However, he did not send it in, and the immediate judgment of all was that Acton tacitly agreed with the *Times'* comment. The Catholic prelates could not ignore this situation, and two of them immediately entered the picture: Archbishop Manning and Bishop Brown, who was Acton's own bishop.

On November 12 Manning sent to Acton a letter in which he proposed two questions: (1) Did Lord Acton's reply to Mr. Gladstone have any heretical intent? (2) Did Lord Acton accept the Vatican Decrees? Acton's reply to Dr. Manning has never been published, but a second letter sent by the archbishop to Acton gives us a hint as to the contents of the reply.

Manning states that he is happy to learn that Lord Acton had no heretical intent in his letter to the *Times*. However, his answer to the second question was not sufficiently clear for Manning to determine how Acton had replied, and he therefore requested another statement from him.²⁸ Acton replied on November 18 and informed Manning that he could not answer his second question without appearing to admit what he was writing expressly to deny; namely, that it could be founded on anything except a misconception of the terms and spirit of his reply to Gladstone. Acton added that he had no private interpretation of the Vatican Decrees; that he did not consider it his duty to pursue the comments of theologians for he was content to rest in absolute reliance on God's providence in His government of the Church.²⁹

This reply did not satisfy Archbishop Manning who decided to take the matter to Rome. Whether Manning did this or not is not known. The matter was never opened again for nothing was heard from Rome. By April of 1876 Acton was convinced that all was well between himself and Rome.

It would be well to close this paper with two quotations from the last of Acton's writing on the question of the Vatican Decrees. The first is taken from his second letter to the London *Times*, which was a reply to those who demanded proof for some of the statements made in his initial letter to the paper, and in which, as we have seen, he made some damning statements concerning the ecclesiastical history of the papacy.

I know that there are some whose feelings of reverence and love are unhappily wounded by what I have said. . . . Our Church stands, and our faith should stand, not on the virtues of men, but on the surer ground of an institution and a guidance that are divine. Therefore, I rest unshaken in the belief that nothing which

the inmost depths of history shall disclose in time to come can ever bring to Catholics just cause of shame or fear. I should dishonor and betray the Church if I entertained a suspicion that the evidences of religion could be weakened or the authority of Councils sapped by a knowledge of the facts with which I have been dealing, or of others which are not less grievous because they remain untold.³⁰

The second quotation is contained in a letter which Lord Acton wrote to his own bishop, Dr. Brown, and is a clear statement of his position in relation to the council:

To your doubt whether I am a real or a pretended Catholic I must reply that, believing all that the Catholic Church believes, and seeking to occupy my life with no studies that do not help religion, I am, in spite of sins and errors, a true Catholic, and I protest that I have given you no foundation for your doubt. If you speak of the Council because you suppose that I have separated myself in any degree from the Bishops whose friendship I enjoyed at Rome, who opposed the Decrees during the Discussion, but accept them now that it is over, you have entirely misapprehended my position. I have yielded obedience to the Apostolic Constitution which embodies those Decrees, and I have not transgressed, and certainly do not consciously transgress obligations imposed under the supreme sanction of the Church. I do not believe that there is a word in my public or private letters that contradicts any doctrine of the Council; but if there is, it is not my meaning, and I wish to blot it out.³¹

After 1874 Acton rarely touched on the subject of infallibility. However, he retained many of his hostile feelings for the Ultramontanes, as his correspondence of the eighties with Mary Gladstone well attests. In general, however, it may be said that the Acton-Vatican Council struggle ended in April, 1875.

Lord Acton attacked the proposed definition of papal infallibility because he sincerely felt that it was an erroneous doctrine which would greatly injure the Catholic Church. I believe this was his basic reasoning in demanding the rejection of infallibility. Certainly, there were no personal motives, nor was there to be personal gain. Acton's study of history had convinced him that the acceptance of the definition would shackle the Church and lead to loss of her power and prestige. Acton, who studied human beings closely, felt that infallibility in the hands of an amoral pope could be disastrous. His conservative spirit felt that the interjection of infallibility at the late date of 1870 would necessitate some shifting by Catholics. He pictured infallibility as applied to all papal bulls, etc. However, once the fight was lost, Acton conceded his position in the interests of his Church and his salvation.

²⁷ London *Times*, November 9, 1874.

²⁸ Gasquet, *op. cit.*, pp. 366-67.

The American Newspaper

(Continued from page four)

plishments, or omissions, of the national legislature. The "Proceedings in Congress" were published in great detail. The president received relatively little attention, except in time of emergency or election. Even in this latter instance the president's name was not publicized to the same extent as it is today. It is interesting to note that the speeches delivered in the Senate and the House of Representatives were generally reported: "Speaker Clay said . . .", "And then the Honorable Mr. Calhoun continued . . ."

Local political campaigns received a goodly amount

²⁹ Correspondence of the First Lord Acton, pp. 151-152.

³⁰ Gasquet, Abbot, *Lord Acton and His Circle* (London: Burns & Oates, n. d.), pp. 359, 360.

of coverage, but "local" news items of an ordinary nature were not published to any great extent. This latter is quite understandable because the cities and towns were not very large in population and extent. Consequently the local citizenry knew most of the details of local occurrences before the editor could get his paper to press. In towns where the paper appeared only weekly or semi-weekly the local news was "old stuff" by the time the publication was presented to the readers. In connection with the matter of news coverage, it might not be out of place to mention here a phenomenon which struck the writer as rather strange. The United States of first quarter of the nineteenth century was not, of course, as large territorially nor was it as thickly populated as it is today, but the United States of 1800-1825 was not, on the other hand, a "postage-stamp" nation in size. Strange as it may seem, the people of the various sectors of the country must have possessed an excellent knowledge of native geography for it is very common to read in a Richmond, Baltimore, or Philadelphia paper that such and such a thing happened in Newport with no mention of the State of Rhode Island, or Newburyport with no mention of Massachusetts; the same arrangement prevailed in northern papers with reference to southern cities. It is true that Vermont was generally attached to any and all items emanating from the "metropolis" of Poultney in the Green Mountain State.

Wars and rumors of wars at times received greater news space than did national political affairs. The doings of Napoleon Bonaparte received extended attention. The major battles of the Napoleonic campaigns were reported in much the same fashion as the battles on land and sea during the recent war. For the most part news of this type was gleaned from European papers and was printed verbatim. The various neuroses of Adolph Hitler, his acts of exhibitionism, his stamping about in anger, his chewing the corners of any available rug, all had their parallels in the "rumours" that reached America concerning the actions of Bonaparte. The King of England and the prominent members of his government received a goodly portion of criticism, couched in vivid language, during the years 1812 through 1815.

During the years of the War of 1812, England was the target of high-powered propaganda. The good citizens of the United States were, if anything, more gullible than modern generations. Instances of grievance were recounted at considerable length and captioned variously, "British Barbarity," "Instances of British Perfidy". Reports of British outrages on the northern frontier, particularly the British-sponsored Indian atrocities, were made to surpass the horror stories which shocked the world in 1917 and 1918. In some respects Kaiser Wilhelm's soldiers were as gentle as lambs when compared with the British and their Indian allies—if the news reports conformed to reality. The naval encounters between British and American ships were described in detail, and it was not uncommon for the editor to publish biographical sketches of successful commanders, both on sea and on land. We

can well imagine that the life stories of the country's heroes made interesting reading for the uneasy populace during the dreary war years.

Indian affairs in the west were reported almost constantly throughout this entire period. Normally a column, or the greater portion of a column, was set aside for reporting Indian news. Treaties effected with the tribes, atrocities committed by dissatisfied groups, and the movements of this or that Indian nation, especially in the upper Mississippi Valley area, comprised the "Indian News" for the most part. In the early years, Chillicothe, Ohio, was the great clearing point for news of the Indians. Later, St. Louis, listed as Louisiana Territory, Missouri Territory, and finally Missouri, superseded Chillicothe as the center for transmission of Indian items to the eastern papers.

During this same era such national issues as the proposed Bank of the United States, internal improvements of varying types, canal building, turnpike development, the negotiations with Spain for acquisition of Florida, the Missouri Compromise, the Monroe Doctrine, received their due share of news-space. Tariffs, taxes, and imposts were discussed and thrashed out in quite the same manner as in this our own day. At times, articles on specialized subjects superseded even political and financial matters of national scope. The introduction of Merino sheep into the United States in 1810 occasioned article upon article in well-nigh every newspaper describing the value of such sheep, their excellent qualities, the best manner to care for them, instructions for the detection of their peculiar ills and ailments.⁷ Perpetual motion intrigued the readers of the day, and the editors were avid to print any new theory advanced. Needless to say, despite the multitudinous theories formulated, none have proved quite as practical as they seemed plausible to the publishers. During the war years several suggestions were reported at great length, and with no little graphic detail, for the development of "torpedo warfare." Theories of dubitable ingenuity, and equally dubitable practicality, were offered to the authorities for the sinking of enemy vessels by the attachment of under-water explosives to their hulls. With the return of peace in 1815 interest rose in the territories located to the west of the Appalachian Highlands, and many articles appeared describing the lands bordering the Ohio Valley, the upper Mississippi and Missouri Valleys. The beauty and wonders of the western country were described in great detail.

Letter writing has long been an avocation of many literate people, and the modern press still devotes space to "Letters to the Editor." The letter writers of yesterday were much more "long-winded" than their im-

⁷ By way of illustration, almost every newspaper in the east reported the arrival in St. Louis of a Mr. Crane, late from England, with his wife, five children, all the necessities for the equipment of a blacksmith shop and "two Merino rams." Advices from St. Louis note that Mr. Crane would be a welcome addition to the place.

The *National Intelligencer*, Tuesday, March 9, 1913, printed the obituary notice of Robert R. Livingston, Esq., former ambassador to France, and listed among his other accomplishments the fact that he was "the man who introduced Merino sheep into the United States."

tators of today. Very long and very verbose letters filled many a column of news-space. Generally they reflected the writer's views on some current political or diplomatic issue. Their contents were not necessarily confined to matters of a purely domestic nature for, at times, foreign policy and foreign relations were treated and, always, at great length. The national administration often received commendation or biting criticism, accordingly, as its actions pleased or displeased the writer. The letters were always signed, but rarely did the christian name of the author appear. "Boanerges," "Vindicator," "Jude," "Publicanus," "Americanus," "Turpentine," "Tar and Feathers," "Leonidas," are but a few of the pseudonyms adopted by the hyper-prolific penpushers of the age.

Calamitous happenings received proper notice. Earthquakes, hurricanes, and disastrous fires of any magnitude were duly reported. News of a disaster was normally captioned in a manner bordering on the sensational: "Earthquake Rocks New Hampshire." "Disastrous Hurricane," "Tragic Fire at Richmond." Murders were recounted as at present and were frequently designated: "Dastardly Deed," "Foul Murder." Reports of epidemics in the urban centers were printed far and wide, and the editors made special effort to inform their readers of the progress or recession of the outbreak. The symptoms proper to the particular ailment were described in minute detail, and the precautions to be taken against infection were delineated with equal detail. Hydrophobia was an affliction much mentioned in all the papers during the summer months. The publishers eagerly seized upon any and all, domestic and foreign, articles treated of the dreaded ailment. With the approach of the summer season expressions of anxiety concerning yellow fever and cholera appeared in much the same manner as articles treating of polio appear in our papers today.

Vital statistics were listed, births excepted. The latter received special mention only when some good lady presented her husband with triplets or quadruplets, but it was not the custom to record the arrival of twins or single births. Deaths were publicized in elaborate fashion and the following illustrations may be considered typical:

In Loudon county, Virginia, on Tuesday last, Abraham Barnes Thompson Mason, Esq., in the 52nd year of his age. With great eccentricity of character, he was endowed with undaunted courage, distinguished genius, and with the virtues of humanity and benevolence in an eminent degree.⁸

OBITUARY

. . . on the 14th Ult. (at Dr. Locket's where she was about finishing her education), Miss Martha E. S. Cousins, eldest daughter of Mr. John Cousins of Amelia. She was attacked with remitting fever; though violent, seemed yielding to the proper remedies, but, one of those accidents happening, which mocks human prudence, put a sudden period to her life. Her attendants, catching a moment of repose, whilst she slept, found her on the floor upon awakening, where she had fallen! She fell on her face, and set her nose to bleeding; it could not be restrained, until she had lost so much blood, that she died from debility. She was the idol of her Parents, the delight of her School-fellows, and highly respected by all her acquaintances—she promised to be an ornament to society; for, though she had been only about 18 months at school, she made great progress in English Grammar, Geography, and the other branches of knowledge usually taught young Ladies.

⁸ National Intelligencer, Tuesday, January 19, 1813.

And if there be a human tear
From passion's dross refined and clear
'Tis that which pious fathers shed
Upon a dutiful daughter's head.⁹

The suicide of one William Motley, a clerk in Petersburg, Virginia, moved a writer to compose the following for the columns of the *Petersburg Courier*:

'Tis finished—'tis done,
The spirit is fled;
Our townsman is gone
Young Motley is dead.¹⁰

Almost all died fortified with the Christian faith, and bore their ills with fortitude, patience, and forbearance.

Marriages were announced: "Last evening, by the Rev. Mr. Stickney, Mr. Outerbridge Wigglesworth to Miss Elvira Culpepper, amiable daughter of Mr. Horace Culpepper, both of this place." The young lady was very frequently, "amiable" and, at times, "accomplished" as well. More often than not, the vital statistics were of a purely local nature, but the marriage or demise of individuals prominent in political life or possessed of social stature would receive notice in distant cities and towns.¹¹

Notices and advertisements were allotted a generous share of the available news-space. Legal notices appeared with great profusion and were even printed in the "tri-weekly" editions of the daily publications, in which advertising space was reduced to a bare minimum. Periodically, long lists of names were published to acquaint the reading public that there were many, many unclaimed letters at the local post office addressed to so and so, etc., etc. It is not uncommon to see a full page devoted to the printing of these "mail lists."

In the southern papers, for example, those of Baltimore, Washington, Richmond, New Orleans, advertisements for the apprehension of runaway slaves appear frequently, and notice was always included as to the reward offered for the return of such slaves. In the northern papers advertisements may be seen for the apprehension of missing apprentices and indentured servants. Reward offerings, in both instances, ranged anywhere from one cent to fifty, or more, dollars. Normally the reward offerings for the return of slaves ranged much higher than for apprentices and indentured servants.

Horse stealing was a common affliction of the age and notices of such calamitous, outrageous occurrences were often captioned, "Stop Thief." The following appeared in the *National Intelligencer*, February 2, 1813:

⁹ Richmond Enquirer, October 4, 1815.

¹⁰ Richmond Enquirer, September 9, 1815. Reprinted from the Petersburg Courier of September 4.

¹¹ The Columbian-Centinel of Boston published each and every item of a vital nature that was available. Deaths from every sector of the country were listed, as were marriage notices. Ship sailings and arrivals at the different coastal cities were noted. Consequently this paper is a veritable gold-mine for necrologists and genealogists.

The following notice which appeared in the *New York Herald*, August 15, 1810, is a typical marriage notice as to form, but scarcely so as to content: "In New Orleans, Mr. Alexander-Phillip-Socrates-Aemilius-Caesar-Hannibal-Marcellus-George Washington Treadwell, to the amiable Miss Carolina-Sophia-Margareta-Maria-Julienne-Wortlet-Montague Joan of Arc Williams". The editor of the *Louisiana Gazette* insisted that the above was merely a fiction of some northern imagination and denied that any such marriage had taken place in New Orleans.

STOP THE THIEF ON A SMALL DUN HORSE!!
FIFTY DOLLARS REWARD.

Some of the advertisements were of a most personal and domestic nature. The following appeared in the *Richmond Enquirer*, January 16, 1816, under the heading, "Wife Advertised".

Runaway from Patrick M'Dallogh—Whereas my wife, Mrs. Bridget M'Dallogh, is again walked away with herself, and left me with five small children and her poor blind mother, and left nobody else to take care of house and home, and I hear she has taken up with Tim Guigan the lame fiddler the same that was put in stocks last Easter, for stealing Barney Doody's game Cock. This is to give notice that I will not pay for bite or sup on her account to man or mortal, and that she had better never show the marks of her ten toes near my house again.

Patrick McDallogh.

P. S. Tim had better keep out of my sight.

A New Yorker had occasion to advertise a loss of quite a different nature than that of the unfortunate McDallogh. The *New York Herald*, September 26, 1812, printed the following notice.

Misfortunes of a Wig and its owner—Out of charity to the unfortunate gentleman who advertised his loss in the *New-York Gazette*, we re-publish his case gratis: The person who took the Wig off the Gentleman's head in Water Street, near the New-Market, last night, will please to leave it at the house of Mr. Smith Place, No. 173 Cherry Street, otherwise his name will be exposed to the public.

Advertisements for medicines and "nostrums" were ever-present in the papers, and one cannot but be markedly impressed by the claims advanced as to their efficiency. If the remedies were as efficacious as claimed, it is a matter of wonder that anyone died. Assuredly, if the "cure-alls" of the age were possessed of the properties attested by the advertisers, medical science has retrogressed to a terrifying degree during the last century. There was scarcely an ailment for which some "quack" or other did not have a most certain and absolute cure. By way of assurance, if some of the remedies did not cure certain ills, ordinarily fatal in this our own day, "on one application", the purchaser was guaranteed the return of his money. Laxatives of an extraordinarily effective nature, cures for cancer, various types of restorative pills, skin lotions and balms were available for all who might wish them. The skeptical abandoned their doubts when they read the convincing testimonials which accompanied many of the advertisements. Even the complete cynic was inclined to investigate when he read that Doctor So-and-So had discovered a new remedy which, "in conscience", he felt bound to share with the general public. As to the modest claims of the advertisers:

HAMILTON'S GENUINE ESSENCE & EXTRACT OF MUSTARD.

A safe and effectual remedy for acute and chronic Rheumatism, Gout, Rheumatic Gout, Palsy, Lumbago, White Swellings, Chilblains, Sprain, Pain of the Face and Neck.

This valuable remedy is prepared both in fluid state and in pills, and thus excellently adopted (*sic*) for external and internal use.¹²

It would seem that suicide, violence suffered at the hands of another, or, possibly, accident, comprised the only avenues of escape from this mortal coil, so efficacious was nineteenth century medicine. The way out of this mortal life via senility was definitely barred

to those who would indulge themselves the use of easily obtainable "restorative pills."¹³

Journalistic techniques, quite obviously, were not as advanced as at the present, and it is rather common to find an important debate in Congress or an account of one of Napoleon's battles followed immediately by a letter from a man in Wheeling to a friend in Chillicothe, describing the odd phenomenon that had occurred when the former sank a well on his property. Strange as it may seem, salt water gushed up from the bowels of the earth in place of the anticipated fresh water. One never quite knows what the following article will treat.¹⁴ A proclamation by the President of the United States may well be followed by an article describing the beneficial effect of clean, dry cotton when applied to burns. Such inconsistency is quite understandable when one reflects that the papers were not "sectionalized" as they are today. There were no magazine supplements, household pages, sports pages, and so forth. All the news that was deemed worthy of publication was distributed over the four pages of available space. While, at times, it is rather amusing, at other times it is most confusing for the modern reader to find an account of international, world-shaking import, followed by some insignificant local item. The news was seldom "reported" for the editors printed it as received or as copied from other papers. The reproduction of the same article, word for word, comma for comma, in different newspapers was very common. Sometimes the original source was accredited, but not always by any means. One suspects that many of the editors relied more upon a pair of shears than they did upon the quill and ink-pot. The following is typical of an acknowledged article.

REVOLUTION IN MEXICO

The following proclamation of Colonel Bernardo "To the Republican volunteers at Nacogdochez" is copied from a Natchez paper. It is interesting as affording information of the progress of the patriots whose success we most heartily desire.¹⁵

Despite their shortcomings and deficiencies when judged by twentieth century journalistic standards the United States newspapers of the early nineteenth century did record, as far as was possible, a faithful picture of domestic and foreign events. They preserved for posterity, as do our newspapers of the present day, the accomplishments, omissions, and foibles of mankind. They constitute a veritable treasure house of historical lore. Their value for purposes of historical research cannot be estimated too highly. As the man who may rightly claim to be the greatest living authority on the history of early United States newspapers recently observed: "If all the printed sources of history for a certain century or decade had to be destroyed, save one, that which could be chosen with the greatest value to posterity would be the file of an important newspaper."¹⁶

¹² The following, which is by no means extraordinary, appeared in the *National Intelligencer*, December 15, 1812. "As I have been always successful in curing Cancers, I wish to inform the public at large, that through the good providence of God, I have it in my power to cure cancers of all kinds on any part of the human body, in the eye, mouth, nose, or breast, whether it be broken or not: by applying the medicine once only, without the least injury to any part affected by the cancer. The cancer will be dead in less than eight hours, at which time the pain will subside.

¹³ This advertisement which may be considered typical appeared in the *National Intelligencer*, January 7, 1813.

. . . if I do not cure the cancer I will oblige myself to return every cent of the money they pay me. . . .

William A. Lilly.

¹⁴ It is not uncommon to see a column or two of news-space devoted to "A Philosophical Disquisition on Shaving" or "The Stupidity of Womenfolk Who Would Improve on the Handiwork of God by Wearing Corsets." The account of a major United States naval victory might well be followed by one of the above or some such question as, "How to Avoid Snow Falling from the Rooftops?" To satisfy the curiosity of the reader, the answer generally given to the foregoing question was "to walk in the middle of the street."

¹⁵ *Niles Weekly Register*, October 17, 1817. The *Weekly Register* is not technically classified by journalists as a newspaper, but the writer has felt it apropos to use it in citation for its contents were drawn from the columns of domestic and foreign newspapers. In conversation with the writer Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, director of the American Antiquarian Society and noted authority on early American newspapers, observed that "Niles most likely edited the *Weekly Register* with a large pair of sharp shears in his right hand." With reference to the contents of the above citation, the editors were woefully ignorant of the geography of the Spanish Americas. It is not uncommon to see Mexico described as "that vast, rich and fertile province of South America." In the later years of the period the editors did possess a fairly accurate knowledge of South American geography.

One of the first editors to "report" the news was Benjamin Russell of the Boston *Columbian-Centinel*. Cf. Mott, *op. cit.*, 131, 132.

¹⁶ Clarence Saunders Brigham, *History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820*, 2 vols. (Worcester: The American Antiquarian Society, 1947), vol. 1, Introduction, p. XVII. This work which represents some thirty-five years of research is a "must" for anyone who would do serious work in the field of early American newspapers. In these volumes Mr. Brigham lists the names of all known American newspapers published between 1690 and 1820, the number of copies extant and the places where they may be found. Mr. Brigham has been a member of the staff of the American Antiquarian Society since 1909 and has been the director of its library and vast newspaper collection since 1930.

Alemany to California

(Continued from page six)

from far-off Rome to the Golden Gate, and adverted to his genuine and complete surprise when he had been elevated to the episcopal dignity and sent to them by the Holy Father himself. Alemany thus concluded his address:

Your religious feelings on this occasion permit nothing but happy prospects to the clergy of California. As long as the faithful will appreciate the worth of religion, so long can their spiritual prosperity be guaranteed. This is one of the principal reasons why our church in the United States has attained, in a few years, a growth like that which San Francisco has made in a few months.

Two or three years ago, the insignificant town of San Francisco could scarcely meet the eye of the student of geography; today, the name of this large and important city resounds throughout the world. That God may prosper and bless His people, and that you may always invoke His blessings upon me, is the prayer of my heart.⁹

By the highly significant appointment of one who, though of Spanish birth, was an American citizen and a veteran of ten years apostolic ministry in the United States, the Holy See had officially taken cognizance that a new era was dawning for Catholicism by the western sea. The changes, better called upheavals, consequent upon the discovery of gold, had called for an early appointment of a worthy priest and prelate to the church of California. Rome had chosen well in giving that church to Joseph Sadoc Alemany.

⁹ *Ibid.*

WITTMAN ON HISTORY

Thomas L. Coonan
Saint Louis University

ERNO WITTMAN'S history, *A Guide to Peace*, published by the Columbia University Press in January, 1948, is one of those very pretentious works which demand considerable study, if only to satisfy oneself that the author is in his right mind and, if not, that the reader or reviewer still is. One's first reaction is to fit Dr. Wittman and "all his works and pomps" into the Popian formula contained in lines fifty-two and fifty-three of the Third Part of the *Essay on Criticism*:

The bookful blockhead ignorantly read
With loads of learned lumber in his head.

To speak of formulas, the preceding lines are not uncalled for. Dr. Wittman fits history as a whole, with all its component parts, which as he conceives it, runs all the way from cosmic energy through flora to *homo sapiens*, into a formula, and what a formula! Centripetal and centrifugal forces operate within an entity, whether celestial bodies or nations. The result of this infinite flux and reflux is an inter-connected universe in time and space, articulated into bodies whether planetary or national, and each tending towards independence only to find itself hogtied to the past and badgered between the competitive forces of integration and disintegrations. These competitive forces cause the continuous division and merging of bodies, and this division and merging of bodies is in turn the history of the universe of the world and of society. In the development of nations and empires, then, history merely describes the integration and disintegration of such separate but interdependent bodies. Dr. Wittman does not dignify his philosophical formulism with a name, but as far as one can glean from his obtuse and prolix thesis it is the ancient, oft-exploited and generally discarded doctrine of mechanistic determinism applied to the history of human society, complicated by a variation of the metaphysical heresy of Heraclitus; *esse rerum est perpetuum fieri*. To Heraclitus, everything is flux; to Dr. Wittman, everything is flux and reflux. And so Dr. Wittman's *homo sapiens* is chained to, and bounded by the past, battered hither and yon by the present, and forever seeking security in the future. No wonder!

Dr. Wittman does not believe in his own formula. Accordingly, his book abounds in contradictions. On page seven, he declares that man is chained to his heritage like Prometheus to his rock. "Traditions, customs, laws, precedents, wisdom, and prejudices all come down to us in an untidy bundle of contradictions." He then proceeds to elaborate on the amazing change in idea and outlook between the men of the nineteenth century and those of the twentieth. The fashion of the former was materialism and mechanism, that of the latter, intuitionism and skepticism. Half conscious of his *faux pas*, Dr. Wittman notices that

¹ *History: A Guide to Peace*, by Erno Wittman. New York. Columbia University Press. 1948.

even among changing views and ideas, there are "recurrences" and "connections". As an illustration, he points to the homey fact that of the world of books that are continually being sent down from the Parisian boulevards to their wooden graves on the Quay des Grands Augustins, some few are revived and reprinted on the quay and reappear on the boulevards. Dr. Wittman need have no worries: *History: A Guide to Peace* is not likely to find its way back from the quay to the boulevard.

The creature that Dr. Wittman calls man is forever seeking a security limited by the possibilities of this tangible world. In this way the other worldliness of the Christian man, particularly during the Middle Ages, is passed over in a book which professes to be a synthesis of all historical civilizations. Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee are taken to task for predicting the future, yet the author himself goes on to predict the future. But then, of course, it is a question of philosophic method and approach. Spengler and Toynbee are naïve enough to resurrect Hegel's historical morphology (and indeed they are), and see nations or civilizations as entities, each having its own structure and passing through the inexorable stages of birth, adolescence, expansion, over-expansion, decline, and death. These cycles admit of repetition because the stages in each nation's or civilization's history have their own symptoms and from one set of symptoms Spengler predicts the death of Western civilization, while from another set Toynbee predicts that a universal empire will evolve. Wittman, however, assures us that he is too wise to predict the future from symptoms, since the possible sets and sequences can be infinite. He thus shatters his own theory for if, as he insists, society is an organism, then it assuredly must undergo the relentless sequence from birth to death through which every organism passes. If further, and this is Wittman's main argument, society is an automaton continuously subjected to the antithetical forces of centripetal and centrifugal pressure from within and without (due to the attraction and repulsion of its neighbors), then as either of these forces increase in proportion, it ought to be a simple matter for any newspaper boy to tell whether such and such a nation or civilization shows the symptoms of integration or disintegration. How does Wittman attempt to redeem himself? First, he rejects Toynbee's doctrine of symptomatology as unscientific; then he resurrects a doctrine of symptomatology of his own, but limited by the possibility that society prevent its malady by doctoring up the symptoms. Herein, of course, he denies the cardinal point in his thesis: that society is an automaton. But he does not admit such a denial, God forbid! On the contrary, he invokes an ingenious distinction between microcosmic and macrocosmic history, "The world of human atoms" may be viewed *en masse* or as the history of individuals. Society viewed *en masse* is mechanistic.

It has definite characteristics at a deeper level than the local whims of individuals and independent of them. There is no good and no bad nation; states are merely human agglomerations. Their components cannot be created or destroyed, but under the impact of forces or influences emanating from other similar agglomera-

tions they may be split into smaller or united into larger groups just as mechanically as an atom is built up into a bigger atom or broken down into smaller parts by the impact of radiation.

Wittman now counsels the reader to look into the distant past, where even the names of most individuals have vanished and the picture is dim, and he will be able to "synthesise the details of history into a compound which ignores individuals, their actions and their fates, describing merely the trend of the gross movements," and the compound will be subject to the statistical rules of mass phenomena. By this method we are told that the future can be predicted; for the mass movement of society is mechanistic. Unfortunately, however, Wittman, realizing that society *en masse* is neither a figment of his own imaginations nor a collection of individuals, admits that "irregular" individualistic effort can prevent the "regular" mass symptoms from following this or that sequence or for that matter, any sequence at all.

This of course does violence to his theory. Accordingly, with unrestrained rage he downs individuals. Napoleon, Lincoln, Caesar, Alexander, Thomas Aquinas, Joan of Arc are dismissed as "mere marionettes moved by forces behind the scene." In so doing he slips into the very error he is trying so sedulously to avoid; for how could mere marionettes prevent society *en masse*, a mechanistic organism, from responding to the mechanical laws of centrifugal and centripetal pressure? The relationship should be that of cause and effect. Wittman therefore resorts to subterfuge to maintain his point.

Such a mechanistic history of mass movements as we suggest has its own importance, especially in times like ours, when over-rated differences between so-called irreconcilable beliefs heat emotions to a high pitch of intensity. By this method events are told, impartially and without attributions of righteousness or guilt. In order to work out the larger trends of the irresistible forces behind human action in history, ideologies, otherwise important factors, may for the moment be eliminated. By admitting that red or white, monarchists or republicans, have in certain basic respects the same group behavior, we agree that they are not automatically bad if they follow one ideology and good if they follow another, but just groups at certain stages of evolution—without ethics—just savages, so to say. This equalization may be of great importance for our understanding of history.

To the mind of the present reviewer the preceding statement is in itself ample reason for discrediting Wittman either as an historian or as a philosopher. Wittman seems to be torn between two sets of values—materialistic, mechanistic determinism on the one hand and Christian ethics with its heritage of law and freedom on the other. Whether this is so because he feels that atheism is popular in the United States and a Central European intellectual should jump onto the band wagon, or because he is trying to arrive at an opposite conclusion to Toynbee while applying much the same method to much the same premises, is hard to say. One thing is certain, Toynbee's neo-Hegelianism, while as nebulous as the half-witted universal (thesis) from which Hegel himself starts out, is more convincing than Wittman's contradictory confusion of it.

The balance of Wittman's book is an orgy of Freudianism, Darwinism, Hegelianism, Haeckelism, Huxleyism, Haushoferism, Randallism and of all the other "isms" of the growing crop of materialists,

idealists, freethinkers, and skeptics who are self-centered enough to think they are capable of solving the enigma of human existence and of interposing a panacea for human woes after the manner of the specialist in a clinic. The trouble is that they reject the existence of God, the objective character of mortality, the freedom of the will, the common estimation of mankind, and all other such criteria as must be drawn upon in diagnosing a civilization or a nation. "Superbi sunt nihil sciens."

Wittman makes a valiant attempt at organization and division. This would be better appreciated of course if he did not so persistently strive to reduce civilizations and nations to plant organisms and anthills. Organized society as he sees it is nothing more. As anthills come and go, as flora thrive or perish through natural adaptation or the lack of it, as weeds fill up empty spaces, so it is with nations and civilizations. The principle that nature abhors a vacuum is for him an adequate explanation of national aggression, invasion or imperialism. Might is right! The only instrument that the healthy state can employ to remove dead states and extinguish diseased ones is war and that alone, but then war is neither moral nor immoral but rather a moral. So are nations and civilizations, and God is the creation of society.

In his concluding chapters Wittman rejects Toynbee's prediction of a universal empire on the ground that there is no international community of men. This he insists on, but unnecessarily so, because it is one of those truisms that has been drummed into the ears of every schoolboy since the breakdown of President Wilson's League of Nations. Even at that Wittman is renouncing his own principles because he refers repeatedly to the possibility of a catalytic agent such as a political or a religious creed acting as a social nexus in uniting the various races, nations and groups of mankind. Catholicism was the indispensable nexus uniting the tribes of the Carolingian Empire, Islam discharged a like function in the Arabian Empire and the Rooseveltian four freedoms were meant in the same sense no less than ideological communism in the mouth of Stalin.

Wittman's diagnosis of civilization ends with the gloomy prediction of war between the United States and Soviet Russia followed by general social and political disintegration, if not by atomization. The only possibility of avoiding it he believes lies in the slender possibility of a United States of Western Europe ranged around the common nucleus of a united Britain and France. Such a third great power is necessary to maintain equilibrium between the other two because the policy of the United States as well as that of Soviet Russia aims at the creation of a world state. The expansionism of the United States is better concealed than that of Russia, but just as Russia seeks to convert the world into a world police state united by the Bolshevik creed, the United States aims to bring about a great federal democracy with an American way of life which she assumes must be equitable for all.

(Please turn to page nineteen)

THE HISTORIC ROLE OF BOURGEOIS LIBERALISM

Thomas P. Neill
Saint Louis University

PROFESSOR SHAPIRO'S serious, scholarly study of Liberalism in France and England in the nineteenth century is an important book.¹ Historians have long felt the need of an adequate objective study of nineteenth-century Liberalism. Ruggiero's work² is too partial to the radical Liberals, Laski's³ is biased because of his Marxian interpretation, and Orton's⁴ treatment of the nineteenth century is fragmentary and to some extent confused. Shapiro's latest work now stands as the most scholarly and best balanced treatment of the subject in English. The author is thorough in his analysis of Liberal writers and Liberal accomplishments, and he is cautious in drawing inferences. And as every conscientious historian should be, Shapiro tries to be objective in analyzing his materials and offering his conclusions.

Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism does not pretend to be a full biography of Liberalism. It is limited geographically and chronologically: geographically to England and France, chronologically to the period between 1815 and 1870. These are the critical countries, though, and the crucial period for a study of Liberalism. If Shapiro's book were in every way satisfactory, then the student would be in a position to understand Liberalism's career in the other Latin countries of Europe and in the rest of the Anglo-Saxon world. Only the Germanies would require independent study.

Slightly more than half the book is devoted to an analysis of that Liberal theory and practice in England and France which led up respectively to the Victorian Compromise and the Bourgeois Monarchy. In this section the author betrays a sympathy for the Liberals as against the conservative, largely aristocratic party, but he does not hesitate to expose the selfishness of the Liberal class, its harshness toward the workers, and the anti-democratic, anti-humanitarian cast of its doctrine. The principal weakness of this first half of the book is the author's failure to give a sympathetic hearing to the conservatives who, after all, had a stronger sense of social responsibility than the Liberals and did more to help the workingman than did the bourgeoisie.

There follow two chapters on the transition from earlier Liberalism to the later democratic Liberalism of the "benevolent bourgeoisie." They are centered around John Stuart Mill in England and Alexis de

¹ *Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism*, by J. Salwyn Shapiro. New York. McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1949. pp. x, 421. \$5.00

² Guido de Ruggiero, *The History of European Liberalism* (London, 1927).

³ Harold J. Laski, *The Rise of Liberalism* (New York, 1936).

⁴ William A. Orton, *The Liberal Tradition* (New Haven, 1945).

Tocqueville in France. Although nothing new is offered in these two chapters, they are balanced analyses of these two men's adaptations of Liberal theory to the post-1848 scene in their respective countries. Professor Shapiro seems to assume here that there is a necessary connection between Liberalism and the coming of democracy—an important point which is not systematically proved. He shows accurately enough in the first part of the work how opposed Liberals were to an extension of the franchise to the petty proprietors and the workers, but in these two chapters he seems to assume that democracy and Liberalism are intimately linked. The point is, of course, that Liberal theory had dissolved the old order, and the industrial revolution had made it impossible for Liberals or Conservatives to hold back the advance of democracy. Usually the Conservatives accepted extensions of the franchise more quickly than did the Liberals. It is therefore difficult to look on democracy as an inevitable result of Liberalism—unless one also holds that Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany are also the fruits of developing Liberalism. Liberalism came first, then democracy, and finally totalitarian rule—but further study is required to determine to what extent the latter two developed from the first, and to what extent they just followed it chronologically.

The last part of Shapiro's book is a study of three "heralds of Fascism"; Carlyle, Proudhon, and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. The chapter on Carlyle is good, but it falls short of McGovern's treatment of the same subject. The chapter on Proudhon is the best in the book. In it Professor Shapiro offers a penetrating analysis of the so-called French anarchist's writings, and he shows how similar Proudhon's reaction to Liberalism was to that of the Fascists in this century. (The implication in this and other chapters that anti-Semitism is an essential item of Fascism is simply incorrect.) The chapter on Napoleon III brings out certain similarities with Fascism, but the reader somehow finishes with the impression that the author has strained badly to make his point here. An equally strong case could be made against any American city boss or against many American politicians, just as an equally strong case could be made to prove that the enigmatic French emperor was a pioneer of the United Nations, or of the Welfare State—but any such case would caricature Napoleon III's elusive profile to fit the author's purpose.

With these reservations we judge Shapiro's study of Liberalism in England and France to be an adequate, scholarly analysis of the movement from 1815 to 1870. It is rather his general conclusion on "the historic importance of bourgeois Liberalism" to which we take exception. He concedes that in the period studied "Liberalism became synonymous with bourgeois class interest, with laissez-faire policies, and with a capitalist economy," but still he believes that it made contributions of "great and lasting value" to democracy and its way of life. We believe, on the other hand, that it was essentially a negative thing, that its results are mainly destructive, and that the criti-

cal age in which we live is a logical derivative of the Liberal society of the nineteenth century.

These two divergent opinions of Liberalism's historic role result, in part, from *a priori* judgments on the worth of contemporary society. One who applauds the secularist society in which we live is predisposed to approve of the Liberalism which brought us here; one who judges modern society to be bankrupt, generally speaking, is predisposed to condemn Liberalism as the secularizing movement of the last century. Secondly, we differ from Shapiro in our estimate of Liberalism because we cannot agree completely with his analysis of its component parts and especially with his conclusions on its historic position.

These differences are revealed especially in his introductory chapter, "What is Liberalism?" and in his concluding chapter on "The Historic Importance of Bourgeois Liberalism." Shapiro begins his first chapter by explaining how nineteenth-century Liberalism was a product of the theories of the *philosophes*, the industrial revolution, and the French Revolution. Quite correctly he indicates that continental Liberalism can be identified with *philosophe* theory and the French Revolution, whereas English Liberalism was mainly an answer to the conditions produced there by the industrial revolution. He then describes the "fundamental views and principles of Liberalism." "First and foremost," he tells the reader, "Liberalism proclaimed a new view of human nature." Liberals followed Rousseau in asserting the essential goodness of man and in repudiating "the Christian view of man's nature." Closely connected with this new view of human nature, Shapiro holds, was the Liberal belief that man is essentially a rational creature. Here the author oversimplifies the basic tenet of Liberalism, for while it is true that Liberals denied original sin and asserted with Rousseau that all evil came from institutions rather than man, still they did not consistently believe in man's goodness or in his rationality. Abundant quotations could be gathered from Liberals like Benjamin Constant to show that they believed in the goodness and the rationality of the middle class, but that they denied these attributes to the aristocrats and the workers.

A second fundamental principle of Liberalism, Shapiro correctly states, was its "completely secular outlook." Although the author makes no specific statement approving these two fundamental assumptions, the reader is forced to conclude that he approves of them as sound developments. This is indicated further when he asserts that Liberalism proclaimed, as its next fundamental principle, "the worth and dignity of the individual." It is difficult to see how either Liberal theory with its secularized view of man or Liberal practice—sweatshops, starvation wages, crippling of children, and such things being "good" and "natural"—upheld either the worth or the dignity of the individual.

Other essential points of Liberalism, according to Shapiro, include equality and liberty, the concept of majority, and faith in popular education. Exception can be taken to each one of these points, indeed has

been taken by many students of Liberalism. The equality of Liberalism is at best equality before the law, and even that turned out to be more theoretical than actual. Certainly the Liberals did not believe in nor practice political equality, for they carefully excluded the masses from the suffrage. And it is hard to see where their civic equality was an advance on the rough equality men formerly enjoyed as members of Christendom. Similar strictures must be made on the Liberal doctrine of personal liberty, strictures which Shapiro does not make in his answer to the question "What is Liberalism?" Liberalism was essentially a selfish theory and a harsh program of action concocted by the middle class in its struggle to obtain control of the state, and any benefits accruing to society as a whole were purely accidental—as Shapiro indicates in the body of his study but fails to bring out in his general description of the movement. The Liberal "faith in popular education," as described by the author, sounds dangerously similar to Communist or Nazi faith in education as a propaganda agency for molding young minds according to the state's pattern.

Our contention is that the author attributes to Liberalism certain beliefs and attitudes which it simply did not possess—nor does his analysis of the movement from 1815 till 1870 indicate that it possessed them. He simply includes them, without proper justification, in his general description of the movement in the first chapter. This is especially true of the "new concept of majority rule." Shapiro holds that Liberalism "instituted representative government" and thus "created a new power in the state, the power of numbers." Such a claim can hold up historically only when it is so qualified and modified that it ceases to have meaning. The majority principle was used in many ways before the nineteenth century, as was the representative system. The power of numbers was reckoned with in religious orders back in medieval times. Something new in government did evolve in the nineteenth century, it is true, but it is a distortion of history to make majority rule a Liberal principle. Bourgeois Liberals feared majority rule and evolved a theory that condemned it as stupid, unnatural, and vicious—as Shapiro honestly points out in the course of his study. Liberalism was a class affair and it held for class government. Majority rule came later in the nineteenth century because Liberalism could not prevent it. Now if those who favored democracy are to be called liberal, they must be distinguished from the bourgeois Liberals Shapiro discusses in his book.

Where, then, to put this bourgeois Liberalism which, Shapiro correctly says, "has long ago ceased to be a factor of importance in England and France"? This is the important point. Liberalism is obviously related in some casual way to our world today, for the present cannot be independent of the past. Do we owe the good things we prize in contemporary civilization to the bourgeois Liberalism of 1815-1870, as Shapiro believes, or is its legacy the troubles and crises we have experienced these last fifty years? Shapiro believes that the modern world is good, by and large, and that

Fascism and other forms of totalitarianism are an historical parenthesis between eras of Liberalism.

It is with this view that we take issue. Admittedly bourgeois Liberalism's legacy is a bundle of many items, and some of them are good. Tolerance of another's honest views, for example, is a good thing, as is the experimental approach in certain areas of study. But these good items, we believe, are not the principal product of bourgeois Liberalism. In essence it was a secularization of Christian principles and attitudes, a revolution in men's minds, as well as in political and social institutions, which rejected the Western past and produced the society of today. A good bit of the Christian past survived this Liberal revolution—for which we are fortunate—but our contemporary secularized society is largely the product of the Liberalism of the nineteenth century. Moreover, we are inclined to believe at this point that Fascism, Communism, and Nazism, three quite similar forms of totalitarianism, are much more the natural children—or grandchildren perhaps—of bourgeois Liberalism than they are parenthetical growths in the evolution of modern Liberal society. Further study on the origin and the essence of these movements will be made when time gives us a better historical perspective of their place in history, but today they seem to fit in as logical fruit of the liberal seeds planted by the *philosophes* and the nineteenth-century bourgeois Liberals.

We are therefore impelled to a paradoxical conclusion on *Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism*. It is a solid, scholarly study by a professionally competent and thoroughly honest historian. The fourteen chapters analyzing bourgeois Liberalism from 1815 till 1870 and describing three pioneers of Fascism are, generally speaking, good chapters. They stand as the best study on the subject in English. The author nonetheless fails in his stated purpose of re-evaluating Liberalism "in the light of its historic evolution," and of emphasizing "the great and lasting values that bourgeois Liberalism gave to democracy and to 'its way of life'."

Wittman

(Continued from page seventeen)

Wittman's book contains a formidable list of *Books Consulted* but is without a bibliographical note. This might have been revealing. There is certainly evidence throughout the book that Wittman's reading has been indiscriminate. As an illustration of this he exalts G. M. Trevelyan out of all proportion to his merit as an historian and, of course, fails to get the important thing that Trevelyan stresses, namely, that the historian knows no more about the future than anybody else. All he can do is point like a showman to the past "with its manifold and mysterious message." The index to Wittman's book calls for impovement. The maps are worse than useless, and the printing is defective in places. The title *History: A Guide to Peace* ought to be replaced by *History: A Guide to Confusion*. For all the mountain of his scholarship, Dr. Wittman has brought forth a mouse.

Book Reviews

The World of the Middle Ages, A Reorientation of Medieval History, by John L. LaMonte. New York. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1949. pp. xxi, 827.

Anyone examining a list of text-books on medieval history might very logically conclude that the field has been covered from every conceivable approach and that, therefore, any new text-book would be superfluous. Nevertheless, Professor LaMonte of the University of Pennsylvania, a recognized authority on the Crusades and the Crusading states, has ventured into the field with, as the sub-title proclaims, a reorientation of medieval history.

Heretofore the standard treatment of medieval history has emphasized Western Europe, Germany and the Papacy, with central, eastern and Byzantine history ignored or dismissed with short notice. Prof. LaMonte maintains that during the early Middle Ages, from the fall of the Roman Empire to the revival of western Europe in the eleventh century, the West was insignificant in comparison with the East. Byzantium was far advanced over the semi-barbarous countries of the West and even the glories of Charlemagne were meagre as compared with the courts of Constantinople and Bagdad. For the first six centuries of the medieval history, therefore, the Byzantine Empire and the Moslem caliphates are made the central theme.

From the twelfth century onward the emphasis shifts to the West and the more accepted pattern on medieval history is followed, although even in this period more than the usual amount of space is given to the Byzantine Empire, the Mongols, Russia and the Baltic lands.

A recognizable problem in any text-book is the relationship between general observations and the amount of detail to be included. The present book inclines toward detail, but a due balance is maintained. A student might find some of the chapters on the lesser known topics, e. g., Byzantium, Saljuq Turks, Russia, Spain and Portugal mere chronicles of names of rulers, civil wars and battles, but to devote more space to them would destroy the proportions of the book.

In a volume containing such a mass of information it is probably unavoidable that inaccuracies and questionable interpretations should creep in. For instance, the Patarini are called the reform party of Milan during the Gregorian movement. Actually the Patarini were an obscure offspring of the ancient sect of the Manicheans who looked upon the body as evil and decried the institution of marriage. The reform movement's attack on clerical marriage and simony was seized upon as paralleling their own beliefs and throughout Lombardy churches were pillaged, married priests assaulted and their wives and children mobbed. Although the Patarini and the reform papacy seemed to be fighting against the same institutions, their purposes were entirely different.

The relations of Gregory VII with Henry IV after

Canossa are not correctly analyzed (p. 259), nor is the basis of the dispute over the lands of Mathilda of Tuscany accurately presented (p. 261). Furthermore, the Concordat of Vienna occurred not in 1477 (p. 699) but in 1448.

In his treatment of the schism and the conciliar movement, the author considers the Pisan pope, John XXIII, as the official pope. He makes no mention, however, of the implications of the reconvening of the Council of Constance by the Roman pope, Gregory XII, prior to his abdication. The principles that only a pope can convene a council and that a pope cannot be deposed were thus established. In general, the papacy of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries receives severe treatment at the hands of the author.

As a well-balanced, thorough treatment of the world of the Middle Ages, the present volume will meet the needs of every teacher of medieval history, and will serve as a useful source of information for anyone seeking a better understanding of the various phases and epochs of the thousand year period which laid the foundations for the modern period.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

Medieval Russian Churches, by Samuel Hazzard Cross, Cambridge. The Medieval Academy of America, 1949. pp. xiv, 95; 113 illustrations. \$7.50

As a tribute to Samuel Hazzard Cross, who died in 1946, the Medieval Academy of America has published the present volume, based on a series of public lectures delivered in the Fall of 1933 following a year's study of churches in Russia with Kenneth John Conant, who has edited this posthumous volume.

In his study of medieval Russian churches, Dr. Cross has traced the church architecture from the tenth century to the seventeenth, from the earliest contacts with Byzantium to the period of Peter the Great when the doors of Russia were flung wide to western culture and Russia abandoned its medieval traditions to follow the contemporary schools of the West. In this survey the author examines the early Kievan structures, which though under strong Byzantine influence, nevertheless developed deviations which gave the churches an individuality of their own. From Kiev he has followed the Byzantine influence northward to Novgorod, where western motifs of external decoration modified but did not supersede the Byzantine traditions. The third center of early medieval Russian culture was the principality of Vladimir-Suzdal, situated slightly to the northeast of modern Moscow, where once again the Byzantine and Kiev influences predominated, although there are adaptations of Romanesque elements to a Byzantine base.

In the thirteenth century the Tartars laid waste the southern and northeastern sections of Russia and all artistic interests lay dormant for a century and a half. With the rise of Moscow in the fifteenth century, however, there occurred a renaissance of Russian art, exemplified by construction of new churches in

and about Moscow as the nucleus of national recovery, but the long period of architectural sterility occasioned serious break in the Russian architectural tradition, and during the revival there is a return to more primitive wooden architecture which brought about many changes in the traditional mode of church building.

Although the treatment of six centuries of Russian church architecture is very sketchy, and the main trends are noted rather than analyzed, nevertheless the text and the illustrations can aid in the understanding of medieval Russian culture and afford an appreciation of the tremendous influence which Constantinople had upon Russia and eastern Europe.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

The Catholic Reformation, by Pierre Janelle. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Co. 1949. pp. xiv, 397. \$4.50

When did the Catholic reform begin? Was it before or after the time that Luther used pen, ink, nail, hammer, and cathedral door? It is a generally mistaken impression that the Counter-Reformation (a gross misnomer) was a consequence of and reaction against the Protestant Revolution. What is your opinion? The answers which are given to the above questions by Pierre Janelle are not absolutely original but they are basic to a thorough understanding of the "second birth" of the Church. They are to be found in his recently published book, *The Catholic Reformation*.

A hurried glance at the table of contents may lead the scientific historian to leave the book unread. On the other hand, the touch-and-go student of history taking an equally hurried look at the wide number of topics covered would hope to complete his study of the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries in one quick gulp by hurriedly scanning this novel-length book. Perhaps you have guessed why these two individuals have reacted as they have: the bewildering diversity and number of topics discussed. I will name but a few: ecclesiastical administration, morality within and without the Church, devotion, education, literature and art. And all of this within the scope of three hundred and sixty seven pages!

But our two friends would be far from a correct estimation of the true worth of this excellent book. Granted that there is a wide variety of subjects covered; another quick glance (by our hurried, scientific friend) at the critical bibliography at the end of each chapter would give him grounds for a revision of his snap judgment "unscientific" or "could not possibly be scholarly". Out of diversity comes order and unity when Dr. Janelle uses these varied subjects to point out the revival of the traditional piety among the Western Europeans.

It is Dr. Janelle's thesis that the Catholic Reformation began before the Protestant revolt as a continuation of the Christian humanist movement of the late fifteenth century. This movement not only amended the discipline of the Church, but exerted its influence in every field of human endeavor. The point is well made that even during the very time which is considered the darkest one in the history of the Church—

that of the scandalous pontificate of Alexander VI—the young men engaged in study and meditation received the religious upbringing which was to turn them into the Catholic reformers of the Council of Trent. Such of the Fathers of Trent as were fifty years old at the opening of the council had spent their decisive years of formation between 1500 and 1510.

On the other hand, the man who wishes to learn all about the Catholic reform by reading the fewest number of pages possible, will at first be attracted to Dr. Janelle's book. But as he reads, he will find material so rich and pregnant with fruitful ideas that he will not be able to digest it all with one quick reading. Dr. Janelle's book is not written in the popular style, it is not a literary masterpiece. The prime function of a historian is to search out and interpret facts, and this is what our present professor at Clermont-Ferrand University, France, does.

EUGENE KELLY.

Makers of the Modern Mind, by Thomas P. Neill. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1949. pp. xi, 391. \$3.75

Professor Neill addresses himself in this book to the difficult and urgent problem of how we came to be the manner of men we are. Just as this is no mere academic question but one of pressing actuality and common concern, so the suggested answer is made in language and concepts readily intelligible to any thoughtful man. Doubtless the author would cheerfully plead guilty to the crime of *haute vulgarisation*, or rather would challenge one to show exactly wherein the crime consists. Norbert Wiener and the promoters of the new science of "cybernetics" assure us that the most acute crisis facing the contemporary world is that of securing prompt, widespread and reliable communication of ascertained facts. This need exists not only in technological and scientific fields but also, and above all, in the humanistic areas of learning. Neill's book is a model of its kind, since it succeeds in conveying to the ordinary man the well-founded results of numerous more detailed and difficult researches on the making of the modern mind.

A project of this sort is faced with two initial questions. Will movements or individuals be stressed, and—in the latter case—which individuals are to be selected? Doctrinaire writers are inclined to set up an antithesis between outstanding persons and broad social forces. Romantic hero-worshippers pay little attention to the environment and general tendencies of an age, whereas scientific socialists pride themselves upon subordinating the personal to the social factor in history. Students without an axe to grind usually read history in a more balanced way, so as to find a place for both kinds of casual influence. Even so, a J. H. Randall will incorporate his analysis of personal contributions to the modern outlook within a context of general viewpoints. Neill follows the other path of organizing his findings around influential individuals, without neglecting the wider pattern of social and economic trends.

It would be difficult and futile to quarrel with the

choice of candidates proposed here for the honor and responsibility of forming the modern mentality. The roll-call includes: Luther, Calvin, Descartes, Locke, Newton, Rousseau, Kant, Bentham, Darwin, Marx and Freud. Except, perhaps, for Bentham, all these men do belong in the front rank of European intellectual history. Yet a German, French or Italian historian would doubtless see matters in a somewhat different perspective. And the fact that no American is included in the list may be a reflection either on the "influential men" approach or on the paucity of widely influential individuals in our country. America has made its decisive impress upon the Western world, but it is difficult to sum up its contributions in terms of any single individual.

A common plan is followed in each of these chapters. Some points of contact between ourselves and the man under consideration are first established; then, the main lines of his biographical and intellectual portrait are drawn; finally, a short summary is offered of his major achievements in regard to the history of ideas. The danger of monotony in this plan is largely avoided by the author's unobtrusive humor, enlightening comparisons and apt quotations. On this last score, many readers would undoubtedly like to ask Professor Neill to supply them with the exact source of the quotations, so that they might do some independent readings along the lines indicated in the text. Perhaps the publisher will make some provision in future editions for an appendix containing full references. Most readers are well able to distinguish between ostentatious learning and truly helpful directions for one's subsequent readings.

The individual sketches, ranging as they do over so wide a territory, inevitably raise questions of interpretation. Misunderstanding can arise, for instance, from terming Descartes' attitude toward the external world one of faith, from maintaining that the concatenation of Cartesian truths is seen at once in an intuitive flash, from reducing all Cartesian ideas to innate ones, and from compressing all Cartesian proofs of God's existence into the so-called ontological argument. Locke is not nearly so superficial a philosopher as George Santayana pretends, and he holds that secondary qualities have at least an objective foundation in real powers. Kant's noumena are not identical with the "raw facts" or matter of sensibility. To speak vaguely about "the method of production" does not do justice to Marx's careful distinction between the forces, modes and relations of production. A much tighter relation could have been established between Marx, Rousseau and Bentham, if account had been taken of Marx's earlier writings. But these are minor points which do not disturb the main structure of this study.

In the introduction, it is stated that "the men treated here are chosen, then, not for the intrinsic worth of their thought but for their importance in making the Western mind what it is today." This does not mean, however, that the problem of truth is abandoned for a standardless historicism. In a quiet but effective way, Neill criticizes each of these influential personages. He

points out their inner contradictions, ruling vice, inhumanity, terrible formalism, fixed ideas, factual errors, one-sidedness and unhealthy effects on culture. Behind these criticisms is an implicit standard of realism, common sense and integral human experience. In a word, the makers of the modern mind are evaluated in the light of what is finally called the traditional Western heritage based on the Classical-Christian view of man as a unit, as a rational animal. The concluding plea for a new synthesis taking account of the traditional conception of man as well as the findings of recent centuries is all the more persuasive for being restrained and indirect. In the conclusion of this book we find Professor Neill expressing not merely the lesson of history but the one which we ourselves have already come to formulate in the course of our reading.

JAMES COLLINS.

Joan of Arc, by Hilaire Belloc. New York. McMullen 1949. pp. 84. \$1.50

This reprint of Mr. Belloc's delightful work on Joan of Lorraine, first published in 1929, will be most welcome to those in whom the recent popularity of the Saint has aroused interest and enthusiasm. Simply and clearly the author takes up Joan's life from her thirteenth year; traces it through her struggles with her family, with Baudricourt, and with the Dauphin; shows her power and vitality in the struggle against the English and the Burgundians at Orleans and Chalons; climaxes the story with the crowning of Charles at Rheims. He closes with a portrayal of the ignominious trial and death of this heroine of France and of God. And all this is done in a style that is beautiful and flowing and musical. To have written so glorious a life in so exquisite a fashion, is but one more accomplishment to endear Mr. Belloc to his large body of readers.

ROBERT V. CALLEN.

History of Europe, by Carlton J. H. Hayes, Marshall W. Baldwin, Charles W. Cole. New York. Macmillan. 1949. pp. 1049, illustrated. \$5.00

This work should prove popular with both students and professors who are concerned with the study of introductory college courses in general European history. In their foreword the authors declare that they have taken care to make the work readable, attractive, and accurate. To the mind of the reviewer they have succeeded admirably in doing so. Within the space of a thousand-plus pages the complete story of European history is related beginning with a consideration of the Ancient Near East down to, and inclusive of, the cleavage between Russia and the Western Powers. The omission of a welter of detail does not impair in the slightest the clarity and completeness with which the record of Europe is recounted. The major, and really important, details of ancient, medieval, and modern histories of Europe and European nations are presented in an orderly, readable, lucid fashion. The authors have produced an excellent work of synthesis.

The volume possesses a sobriety and balanced objectivity in the narration of centuries-long controverted

ppenings. The Reformation, in particular, is presented in a dispassionate, unbiased manner with none of the acrimony or ill-regulated enthusiasms that have, at times, found their respective ways into historical writing. The reviewer was especially pleased with the moderate and just appraisal of the activities of the Spanish in the Americas. The treatment of Spain's colonial empire in the Americas does not, decidedly, take of the unfortunate heritage of the Black Legend of unrevered memory. A plethora of maps and illustrations included in the volume should prove of great value to students and professors alike.

The work will also be available in a two-volume edition—"To the End of the Thirty Years War" and "Since 1648".

BRENDAN C. McNALLY.

Karl Marx's Interpretation of History, by M. M. Bober. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1948. pp. x, 445. \$6.00

This is a thorough revision of the first edition of his work, which appeared in 1927 and has remained the best treatment of the subject. Mr. Bober undertook the revision, however, because additional writings of Marx and Engels have appeared in the last two decades, and because recent viewpoints in economic theory suggested a change of emphasis and treatment of some sections of the original work. The chapter "Marx and Economic Calculation" is completely new, and several other chapters are almost entirely rewritten.

The general plan of the first edition is kept, wisely enough: the author describes in four sections Marx's and Engels' interpretation of history and then comments critically on its different aspects in a concluding section. Mr. Bober handles his subject with admirable objectivity. He sees Marx as a powerful mind who frequently exhibited keen penetration in his criticism of capitalism, but he is not so dazzled by Marx's occasional flashes of brilliance that he tries to justify everything Marx has written. *Karl Marx's Interpretation of History* is a balanced description of the Marxian theory of history and a good, hard-headed criticism of its weak points. The work is well documented, and appended to it is a well arranged bibliography.

THOMAS P. NEILL.

Hellenic History, by George Willis Botsford and Charles Alexander Robinson, Jr. Third edition. New York. Macmillan. 1949. pp. 509. \$6.00

This is the third edition of a work first published in 1922, the second edition of which appeared in 1939. The interval between editions has thus been cut in half. *Sit faustum.*

While beneficial use has been made of the comments of the reviewers (see page v) and maps and plans have been redrawn, the fifteen new maps, nineteen new figures, and thirty-five new plates will commend themselves specially. Even more pleasing, however, from the standpoint of classroom utility, are the list of recommended readings in Greek Literature, the Glossary of Terms, and the Chronological Table, to which some fifteen pages are devoted.

The plates, collected in one place, cover the matter

of sculpture, temples, bronzes, frescoes, houses, mosaics, armor, vases, papyrus, implements, coins and landscapes, and represent the period extending from earliest times to the second century before Christ. The text itself ends with a chapter on "The Encroachment of Rome," which in five pages surveys the condition of Greece from 200 to 27 B. C.

The end papers exhibit an economic map of the Mediterranean World in the fifth century, and a map of Alexander's empire.

The colorful cover of the 1936 edition with its gold coin of Syracuse has been supplanted by a chaste green one, and the volume itself is less bulky.

LEO M. KAISER.

Religion and Education Under the Constitution, by J. M. O'Neill. New York. Harper and Brothers. 1949. pp. xii, 338. \$4.00

Carefully documented and well-organized historical facts form the basis of this book which "is aimed specifically at a better understanding of civil liberties and against the widespread practice of attempting to foreclose debate and to stop the democratic process by distorting the Constitutional provisions in the Bill of Rights. Particularly is this done in regard to the First Amendment, in attempts to make it mean something that it does not say, and which Madison and the other members of the First Congress in 1789 did not believe and did not intend to put into the Constitution." (p. x.)

The author files no brief for such debatable proposals as Bible-reading and prayers, or released-time for religious instruction in public schools, or tax aid to parochial schools, but underlines as of greater importance the question "whether the Justices of the Supreme Court shall pass on constitutional questions in the light of the language and meaning of the Constitution or in the light of their private philosophies of religion and education". (p. xl.) There are two methods of interpreting the First Amendment to the Constitution, the historical and the sociological or progressive; Dr. O'Neill builds his case against the Supreme Court's "judicial legislation" exclusively on the former as the only legitimate foundation for judicial review.

In the first eight chapters Dr. O'Neill examines carefully and logically the important facts of history as well as the surrounding conditions relevant to his problem. These include the thought of Jefferson and Madison on government and religion, the attitude of Congress toward the First Amendment and the record of the Supreme Court prior to 1947. In the next two chapters, on "The Practices of the Several States" and "The Effect of the Fourteenth Amendment", the author points out that the freedom to legislate on matters concerning religion and education was guaranteed to the states by the First Amendment. Consequently, the theory (which is essential to any defense of the constitutional accuracy of the McCollum decision) that the Fourteenth Amendment applies the federal Bill of Rights "in toto" to the states, "takes away from the people of the several states the precise freedom which

A readable study of a little-understood period in history—

THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION

By PIERRE JANELLE

In one volume, this synthesis on the Catholic Reformation traces its beginnings before the Protestant Revolt. Here are all the important aspects—historical, philosophical, spiritual—and the effects of the Movement. "An interesting and scholarly account . . . As the first monograph in English upon a complicated and controversial subject, the book deserves a place in the college, university, and reference library." — *Library Journal.*

\$4.50

History of the Prayer Book of 1549 and how it developed—

The FIRST of the PURITANS and the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER

By PAUL R. RUST, O. M. I.

Published during the 400th anniversary of the Book of Common Prayer, this volume is the result of exhaustive research. It begins with Henry VIII's revolt against Rome in 1534 and extends through the complete anglicanization of the Church in England. Illustrated with rare reprints of the original Edwardine Books of Common Prayer.

\$3.75

At your bookstore.

THE BRUCE PUBLISHING COMPANY

2811 Montgomery Building

Milwaukee 1, Wisconsin

The first full-length biography of an important statesman—

WILLIAM GASTON: CAROLINIAN

By J. HERMAN SCHAUINGER

America's Silver Age produced men like Webster, Clay, and Calhoun who achieved great fame. It also produced the brilliant William Gaston whose outstanding integrity as a judge and legislator won the acclaim of his notable contemporaries. This account reveals his contributions to politics, religion, and social justice. Particularly interesting are his decisions regarding Negroes and slavery while serving on the State Supreme Court bench.

\$3.25

the First Amendment was explicitly designed to preserve". (p. 165.) Dr. O'Neill apparently thinks unjustifiable the long series of Supreme Court decisions beginning in 1925, according to which: (1) certain of the fundamental civil liberties guaranteed in the federal Bill of Rights came to be considered "of the very essence of ordered liberty" and, therefore, subject to federal protection; (2) since the Palko decision in 1937, the Fourteenth Amendment transferred the First Amendment to the states, thus restricting their power. Refusal to admit the validity of any constitutional development outside of the amending process and strict adherence to the doctrine of "stare decisis", is in line with the author's position that the scope of judicial review is defined by the meaning of the words in the Constitution according to the intention of its framers. By this standard the opinions in the 1947 Everson Case and the 1948 McCollum Case are effectively shown to be unprecedented (and the decision in the latter case, unwarranted) departures from the traditional meaning of the First Amendment.

Finally, among the "Antidotes for Chaos" recommended to the American people are "public criticism and protest—the pressure of public opinion" on the court "to give back to the states and the local school boards of the country the constitutional freedom of action which was theirs up to March 8, 1948", and, failing this, "congressional legislation concerning the powers and methods of the Court." (p. 271.)

PATRICIA BARRETT, R. S. C. J.

The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century 1607-1689, by Wesley Frank Craven. Baton Rouge Louisiana State University Press. 1949. pp. xvii + 451. \$6.00

This is the opening volume of a ten-volume "History of the South" being produced under the auspice of Louisiana State University and the University of Texas. Two other volumes have already been favorably reviewed in the BULLETIN and the same praise given them may well be accorded this addition.

Mr. Craven has laid his stress on determining what factors in the Southern Colonies were distinctly "southern", that is, factors which were to remain as distinguishing marks of the South in a later day. For this reason he has generally laid heavy emphasis on English institutions and establishments. The reader is warned of such emphasis which, in view of the declared purpose of the volume and of the series, seems sound. However, the position of the colonies in world rivalries is not neglected for the easy possibility of treating colonial development as though it existed in a vacuum.

A feature of the volume is the critical essay on authorities, invaluable to one who may wish to explore the field of Southern colonial history. This essay seems to typify the efforts of the editors to make the series as useful as possible.

Mr. Craven is a Southerner himself, currently professor of history at New York University.

JASPER W. CROSS.